REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 971 24 EA 001 069

HIGH SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATIONS AND CURRICULUM CHANGE. FINAL REPORT.

BY- HINES, VYNCE A. ALEXANDER, WILLIAM M.
FLORIDA UNIV., GAINESVILLE
REPORT NUMBER CRP-3130 PUB DATE AUG 67
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0576
CONTRACT OEC-6-10-154
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$5.12 126P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HIGH SCHOOLS, *SELF EVALUATION, *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION CRITERIA, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, *TEACHER BEHAVIOR, CASE STUDIES (EDUCATION), PILOT PROJECTS, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, QUESTIONNAIRES, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, GAINESVILLE,

THIS PROJECT EXPLORED THE HYPOTHESIS THAT HIGH SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATIONS BASED ON THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA OF THE NATIONAL STUDY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL EVALUATION PRODUCE CURRICULUM CHANGE AND HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES OF TEACHERS. THIS PROCESS OF SELF-EVALUATION WAS COMPLETED BY THE SCHOOL FACULTY, FOLLOWED BY A REVIEW OF A VISITING COMMITTEE. A CASE STUDY APPROACH WAS EMPLOYED INVOLVING HISTORICAL, INTERVIEW, AND INSTRUMENT DATA COLLECTION IN SELECTED SCHOOLS. THE STUDY SAMPLE INCLUDED 46 EXPERIMENTAL, 13 CONTROL, AND 4 PILOT SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA AND GEORGIA. A STRATIFIED SAMPLE OF SCHOOLS WAS SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF EITHER THEIR MOST RECENT OR PLANNED FUTURE SELF-STUDY. THE PRINCIPAL FINDING WAS THAT CURRICULUM CHANGE OCCURRED AT A HIGHER FREQUENCY IN THOSE SCHOOLS WHICH WERE ENGAGED IN SELF-EVALUATION. ADDITIONAL FINDINGS INCLUDED--(1) THE NUMBER OF CHANGES IN THE EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS WAS ABOUT 50 PERCENT GREATER THAN IN THE CONTROL SCHOOLS, (2) MOST CHANGES WERE MODIFICATIONS OF EXISTING COURSES, SERVICES, OR ACTIVITIES, AND (3) PARTICIPATION IN THE SELF-STUDY DID NOT MAKE TEACHERS MORE OPEN TO CURRICULUM CHANGE, NOR DID METHOD OF PREPARATION RELATE TO THE OPENNESS TO CURRICULUM CHANGE. (DG)

5-0576

24

ED017971

HIGH SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATIONS AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

AUGUST 1967

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 001 069

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 3130
Contract No. OE 6-10-154

HIGH SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATIONS AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

August 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HIGH SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATIONS AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

Project No. 3130
Contract No. OE 6-10-154

Vynce A. Hines
and
William M. Alexander

August 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Florida

Gainesville, Florida

CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

INTRODUCTION 1

METHOD 8

RESULTS 15

DISCUSSION 49

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 58

SUMMARY 62

REFERENCES 67

APPENDIXES

- Appendix A: Lists of Schools 72
- Appendix B: Interview Guide 78
- Appendix C: Facsimile of Instruments
  - C-1: Teacher Opinionnaire on Curriculum Change 80
  - C-2: Teacher Human Relations Questionnaire 88
  - C-3: Teacher Activities Questionnaire 94
  - C-4: Curriculum Improvement Measure 102
- Appendix D: Form, Summary of Interviews 104
- Appendix E: Frequency Tables
  - E-1: Number of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Year and by Method of Preparation 108
  - E-2: Number and Average Number of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Year of Preparation 109

E-3: Number and Average Number of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Method of Preparation. 110

Appendix F: Number and Mean Number of Responses of 1714 Teachers in 46 Schools to Each Item on the Teacher Opinionnaire on Curriculum Change....... 111

LIST OF TABLES

Table   Page

1. Number of Experimental and Control Schools in Florida and Georgia by Year and Method of Preparation for Evaluation by the Visiting Committee................ 10

2. Number and Average Number of Recommendations for Curriculum Change Rejected in 36 Schools by Rank of Reasons for Rejection, Year of Preparation, and Method of Preparation for Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee................ 18

3. Mean Difference Between Number of Curriculum Changes Reported in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by Visiting Committee in Excess of Curriculum Changes Reported in 18 Control Schools Not Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by Visiting Committee by Year and Method of Preparation by Selected Categories.............................. 19

4. Number and Percent of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Method of Preparation............................. 21

5. Number and Percent of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Year of Preparation............................. 21

6. Mean Number of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interviews by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by Year and Method of Preparation 22

7. Differences Between Observed and Expected Frequency of Responses to Selected Questions on Curriculum Changes in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Method of Preparation.................. 24

8. Number of Curriculum Changes Reported in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools Undergoing Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee by Subcommittees of the Evaluative Criteria 25

9. Number and Average Number of Teachers in 46 Schools Reacting to Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee in Interview by Year of Preparation and Category of Reaction... 27

10. Number and Average Number of Teachers in 46 Schools Reacting to Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee in Interview by Method of Preparation and Category of Reaction.. 28

11. Differences Between Observed and Expected Frequency of Reactions to Elements of the Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools by Method of Preparation......... 29

12. Differences Between Observed and Expected Frequency of Reactions to Elements of the Self-Study and Evaluation by the Visiting Committee in Interview by Professional Staff in 46 Schools by Year of Preparation........... 31

13. Impact of Selected Factors in Curriculum Change as Rated by 1714 Teachers in 46 Schools by Year and by Type of Preparation.. 32

14. Impact of Selected Factors on Curriculum Change as Rated by 1714 Teachers in 46 Schools by Ranks By Year and By Type of Preparation................................. 33

15. Helps To Curriculum Change as Seen by 1714 Teachers From 46 Secondary Schools.............................. 36

16. Changes in the Program of the School Resulting From The Self-Study as Rated by 1714 Teachers From 46 Schools by Year and by Method of Preparation................. 37

17. Changes in the Professional Staff Resulting from the Self-Study as Rated by 1714 Teachers from 46 Schools by Year and by Method of Preparation................. 38

18. Influence of Selected Elements of the Self-Study on Curriculum Change as Rated by 1714 Teachers in 46 Schools by Year and by Method of Preparation......... 40

19. Effect of Self-Study and Evaluation by Visiting Committee on Quality of Teaching as Rated by 900 Teachers in 46 Schools in Open-End Response by Year and by Method of Preparation..................... 41

20. Effect of Self-Study and Evaluation by Visiting Committee by Categories of the Open-End Responses Made by 856 Teachers in 46 Schools.............................. 43

21. Analysis of Variance for CIM Using Difference Scores... 44

22. Analysis of Variance for THRQ with Control Schools Included... 45

23. Means and Change by Schools on Pre- and Post-Tests with the THRQ in 10 Experimental and 8 Control Schools.... 46

24. Analysis of Variance for TAQ with Control Schools Included.. 47

25. Means and Change by School on Pre- and Post-Tests with the TAQ in 10 Experimental and 8 Control Schools.. 48

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 46 experimental schools, 18 control schools, and 4 pilot schools who cooperated with us made this study possible. Without the endorsement and support of Dr. Vincent McGuire and Dr. Samuel Shearouse of the Southern Association state committees for Florida and Georgia, so many school doors would not have opened so easily for us. By accepting field laboratory courses almost as school began, the late Dr. John Moorman, Dr. Hal Lewis, Dr. Lee Eggert, and Dr. Vincent McGuire enabled us to fulfill part of our commitment in the design of the study.

This study was blessed with outstanding research assistants--Dr. Kathryn Crossland, Mr. William Dufford, and Dr. Jerold Bauch--for the duration of the study and Dr. Dale Alam, Dr. Tom Vickery, Dr. Charles Henderson, Mr. Del Covell, and Mr. Roger Webb for shorter periods. Mrs. Nancy Hendry has been secretary for the project since its very early days. We are especially indebted to Dr. Crossland and to Mrs. Hendry for seeing the manuscript produced in this final form. Our colleagues, Dr. Charles Bridges and Dr. Wilson Guertin have served as statistical consultants.

Vynce A. Hines

William M. Alexander

University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
September, 1967

INTRODUCTION

This project was undertaken as one approach to the study of curriculum change. Specifically the project sought to determine the scope and extent of curriculum change occurring in selected high schools as a result or concomitant of school self-evaluations conducted in accordance with regional accreditation policies, and of the impact of participation on selected attitudes and practices of the teachers involved.

The Problem

The use of the Evaluative Criteria (33) of the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation (formerly Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards) for self-evaluation by high school faculties has been systematically promoted by the regional accrediting associations since the procedure was developed during the period 1933-39. The common procedure of "self-evaluation" is an evaluation of the school based on the Evaluative Criteria by the school faculty, followed with a review of the faculty evaluation by a visiting committee. The 1940, 1950, and the current 1960 editions of the Evaluative Criteria have been used in this way by thousands of high schools throughout the United States. The purpose of school self-evaluations guided by this publication is stated in its manual section as "to secure a sound appraisal of the quality of a school and encourage the staff to seek better materials and procedures in order that improvement would be a likely result" (33, p. 3).

For example, the use of these evaluations for schools seeking regional accreditation, initial or continued, has been required in Florida by the State Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and has undoubtedly been the most frequently used procedure for improvement of secondary education in the state. In 1967, 68 percent of Florida's high schools (enrolling 78 percent of the children) are accredited by the regional association. During each of the years 1960-67 about 30 secondary schools in Florida carried on evaluation programs using the general procedure set forth in the Evaluative Criteria. The cost of such a study for a Florida high school enrolling 1200 students has been estimated by the investigators at about $20,000 including time of faculty and donated time of visiting committee members.

Although procedures and costs of the self-evaluations vary from school to school throughout the country certainly there are very substantial costs of the self-evaluations and accreditation for the more than 10,000 regionally accredited high schools in the

United States. Clearly the time and effort expended on these evaluations represent a very substantial commitment to this approach to educational improvement. This project therefore aimed to determine whether this approach did, in fact, result in curriculum change and to analyze the extent and nature of change in relationship to certain self-evaluation procedures.

Related Research

Various studies have sought to determine the effectiveness of school evaluations in terms of the acceptance of recommendations from the evaluations. These have yielded generally similar results. Ricard (38) followed-up on 746 total recommendations made by the regional accrediting agency to 12 comprehensive high schools and reported that compliant action was reported on 70.8 percent, action had been postponed on 21 percent, and rejected on 8.2 percent of the recommendations. Hahn (17) reported that of 1998 recommendations made to 35 Oregon schools approximately two-thirds of the recommendations were completed within four years, and it appeared likely that one-third would not be completed. Belt (5) analyzed 5445 recommendations made by the Wyoming State Department to 208 school districts. Compliant action was taken on 73 percent, action was postponed on 17 percent, and rejected on 10 percent of the recommendations. Newman (34) followed up on 691 recommendations sent to secondary schools of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, and reported compliant action on 68 percent, postponement on 22 percent, and rejection on 10 percent of these recommendations. In 1951 questionnaires were sent to all principals of schools who were members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Among other items, they were asked to report on action taken on recommendations that had been the result of their recent self-evaluation. From the eleven states, 4011 recommendations had been made. The respondents reported that 679 had been completed, 3073 had received some action and had been improved partially, and 231 had received no action (42). In his study of 1894 recommendations given 90 Iowa schools, Kiser (20) concluded that state department evaluations were a contributing factor in improving education in Iowa as evidenced by the favorable acceptance and implementation of approximately three-fourths of the recommendations. Both Callender (8) and Mertz (29) found that there was a relationship between the length of time since evaluation and the extent of implementation of educational change. Both studies reported increased compliance to the recommendations with the passage of time. Deitrich (11) reported that the greatest benefits from evaluation occurred within two years of the visiting committee's formal evaluation. Pace (35) examined 954 recommendations to 9 Indiana junior high schools and reported that 299 were concerned with curricular program, materials, equipment, and resources; 206 were concerned with physical facilities and space utilization; 129 with utilization of present staff; 124 with staff coordination and planning; 101 with student records, counseling, and scheduling; 74

with the need for additional personnel; and 21 were concerned with pupil evaluation. Pace noted that visiting committee recommendations tended to reaffirm those of the self-evaluation and that about 57 percent of the recommendations had been implemented, provision had been made for the implementation of 14 percent, no action had been taken on 25 percent, and 5 percent were rejected by the schools.

There are certain limitations of the studies just reviewed so far as the relation of curriculum change and school evaluations is concerned. Recommendations included were not limited to those involving curriculum improvement, and it is not clear why acceptance was sometimes lacking. For example, to state that postponement of acceptance was commonly the result of insufficient funds could mean either a new building or a remedial reading program was needed. A further limitation of these studies is that they relied on questionnaires or one-contact interviews for their data.

That school evaluations provide impetus for curriculum change is suggested in a number of descriptive reports. Rucker (40) discussed curriculum improvements that were a direct result of a self-evaluation project. Buford (7) described the changes that resulted from a faculty-initiated study in Charlottesville, Virginia. Cope (10) found that the most frequently reported improvements resulting from the use of the Evaluative Criteria were in curriculum, pupil activity programs, library services, and guidance services. Ely (15) reported that acquisition of needed personnel and facilities, and increased awareness of the needs of the school by the school board and the community were seen as chief benefits to the school by teachers engaged in the evaluative process. Other descriptions report similar programs and improvements derived from the school self-evaluation process (6), (15), (19), (39), (41), (43), (48).

The practical value of school self-evaluation was indicated in a study by Martin (26). He used a large total sample, consisting of 799 members of school staffs and 395 visiting committee members who were participants in 54 school evaluations. Of the respondents, 79.5 percent of the school staff viewed the self-evaluation procedure as adequate. The visiting procedure was reported adequate by 70.3 percent of the school staff members and 73.1 percent of the visiting committee members. Also, Martin found that 80 percent of the school staff respondents and 90 percent of the visiting committee respondents indicated that in their opinion school evaluations contributed to a better understanding of the school program. Lewin (21) sampled 200 educators, including deans, state department officials, supervisors, and presidents of state administrators' associations, and reported that the majority of the respondents highly recommended self-evaluation studies. The value of self-evaluations was pointed out by Batiste (4) when he found that there was a positive correlation of .73 between self-evaluations and visiting committee evaluations.

The need for a better understanding of the process of self-evaluation is apparent. Baden (2) stated that in none of the four schools he studied was there universal understanding concerning the purposes of the school or how individual departments or courses contributed to the school's purposes. In identifying obstacles that hindered the work of the self-evaluation group, McQuigg (31) stated that a majority of 1044 classroom teachers involved in his study rejected the opinion that curriculum committee work was a part of their job. He also identified as obstacles the amount of additional time required, a lack of credit received, and the lack of implementation of the committee's recommendations. Further he found that many teachers failed to understand their responsibilities in implementing curriculum changes. The role of the externally motivated, improvement process was questioned by Teckman (43) when he concluded from analysis of published standards commonly available from state departments that these standards tended not to encourage local schools to conduct research.

Many studies support the theoretical position that faculty involvement in the democratic process of school self-evaluation will be more effective than curriculum improvement decisions made outside the group. These studies also state that involvement is more effective in terms of attitude change and change in individual behavior (22), (23). Verduin (45) observed that participation in the self-evaluation developed an increased interest in education and its problems. Participants became more aware of inconsistencies in their own curriculum. Also, as a result of the study, Verduin observed that a more democratic and professional attitude developed. Hamill (18) reported that the use of the Evaluative Criteria and California's Procedures stimulated growth on the part of school personnel and resulted in improvement of the educational programs evaluated. In studying the effectiveness of the Evaluative Criteria, Wear (47) indicated that the strongest feature of its use was the self-evaluation phase which served to disturb complacent attitudes, brought educational problems into focus, and provided motivation for improvement. A questionnaire provided Pellegrin (36) with data that indicated high agreement regarding the value of self-study as an instrument of in-service growth, and, therefore, further understanding of the entire school program. Research by Manlove and McGlasson (25), Littrell (24), Ely (15), and Cope (10) also indicated that better understanding of the school curriculum and increased knowledge of subject matter were positive benefits of the self-study process to the faculty. Mathews (28) used a questionnaire to poll 183 administrators who had recently undergone a school self-evaluation. He reported that staff attitudes toward the evaluation tended to improve after the study was completed.
Alam (1) investigated changes in teachers' attitudes as a result of involvement in self-evaluation procedures and concluded that there was no significant relationship between participation in the self-evaluation and expressed attitudes of teachers in the areas of professional human relations. However, Alam reported that teachers'

attitudes tended to become less favorable during the year except in three of the four schools which were engaged in self-evaluation under the leadership of a university consultant where the faculty was permitted to receive college credit for their participation. McClendon (30) found that participation in faculty self-study did not significantly affect the "openness" of the teachers involved. Significantly, those teachers characterized as "more open" prior to the study became less so during the year, and the reverse was true for those initially characterized as "less open."

The foregoing studies tend to support the general assumption that the strength of the school self-evaluation process is that of faculty involvement. However, Miles (32) places little value on the teacher as a change agent. In this same source Eicholz and Rogers suggest that "the major role of the principal is probably not to promote change but to administer the status quo" (32, p. 315). Thompson (44) closely investigated four schools to determine methods of analyzing curriculum developments. School staffs indicated that the school principal in all cases was the most influential person involved in curriculum changes. Three of the four schools reported teachers as second most influential. The fourth school reported the superintendent as second most influential and saw the teacher as playing a highly insignificant role in curriculum improvement. Cay (9) and Thompson (44) found that barriers to participation in curriculum improvement activities appeared when the school principal excluded the faculty from planning and policy-making decisions which affected school operation. Similarly, Banning (3) stated that teachers' attitudes toward change are more favorable if they feel they are making a contribution to the school organization, and if they have a meaningful share in policy decisions and their implementations. Dempsey (12) utilized a "readiness to change" instrument and found that teachers who were "ready to change" perceived fewer barriers to curriculum change than teachers less "ready."

Evaluation, as a phase of curriculum planning, should be somewhat continuous, theory holds, but it appears that this concept is accepted but little practiced. Wear (47) suggested that a continuous evaluation program would be an improvement on the common practice of treating recommendations. Miles (32, p. 657) generalized from material discussed throughout his book and suggested that the evaluation of change is the weak link in the innovative process. Verduin (45) commented that after a year in organized self-study, the staff expressed some disenchantment about the continuation of the self-study.

Thus, the research on high school self-evaluations in relation to curriculum change is not conclusive as to the relationship. There is some evidence that the evaluations produce recommendations which to some extent are implemented, but the evidence is rarely focused on curriculum change. Although staff involvement is prized in theory, the types of involvement and their relationship to changes in teacher attitudes and activities and to curriculum change have not been determined. Hence the present study was undertaken to provide more information on the self-evaluation process as it affects curriculum improvement, and the results of selected types of self-evaluations.

Objectives

This project explored the hypothesis that high school self-evaluations, based on the Evaluative Criteria, produced curriculum change and had impact on the attitudes and practices of teachers. Curriculum change was defined as any addition, subtraction, or modification of courses, activities, or services provided by a secondary school for its pupils. Specific objectives of the project were as follows:

1. What changes in the curriculum of schools undergoing self-evaluation studies can be attributed to the studies?

2. What changes are instituted before the arrival of the visiting committee, and what changes follow recommendations of the visiting committee? (Schools spend several months to a year or more preparing for the visiting committee which checks the school's self-evaluation and makes recommendations. Often problems are identified and changes started before the arrival of the visiting committee.)

3. Are there differences as to apparent effectiveness in producing curriculum change which can be attributed to the preparation pattern? (There are three major patterns in the Southeast for preparing for an evaluation: (1) the school prepares largely on its own; (2) outside consultants are used; (3) university consultants are used under a plan which permits college course enrollment for those faculty members desiring it.)

4. Does participation in a school self-evaluation modify a faculty's readiness for change (as measured by Duncan's Curriculum Improvement Measure)?

5. Does participation in a school self-evaluation modify the quality of teacher human relations of the participants (as measured by Walker's Teacher Human Relations Questionnaire)?

6. Does participation in a school self-evaluation modify teachers' professional activities (as measured by Mathews's Teacher Activities Questionnaire)?

7. How are the self-evaluations assessed by teacher participants, and how do they rate the influence on change of certain other possible sources?

METHOD

This project was a series of case studies involving historical, interview, and instrument data collection in selected schools which had participated in self-evaluations or were going through the process using the Evaluative Criteria and visiting committees, with some use of control schools which had not been evaluated recently and were not immediately contemplating evaluation. Because the evaluation process differs but little from state to state and for economy of time and expense, the schools used were limited to Georgia and Florida. The study was organized in the following phases: (1) selection of schools: experimental, control, and pilot; (2) pilot study in selected schools to check instrumentation and procedures; (3) refinement of instruments and procedures; (4) collection of data in experimental and control schools; (5) analysis of data and preparation of a final report.

Selection of Schools

Lists of secondary schools in Georgia and Florida were obtained from the respective state committees on secondary schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. From these lists, schools were categorized according to the school year in which they had their last complete evaluation--a full self-study, using the Evaluative Criteria followed by a visiting committee. Lists of schools tentatively planning evaluations during 1965-66 and 1966-67 were obtained from the state committees. In many cases reports or other information on file with the state committees made it possible further to categorize the schools by method of self-study. In Georgia, schools prepared by using resources within their own system or had consultative help from their universities, the state department of education, or the Southern Association state committee. Both of these methods were used in Florida plus a third approach involving registration for a course in a state university of half or more of the faculty and the regular consultative help of one or more persons from one of the state universities. Where the method of self-study was not clear, schools were approached by mail or telephone. Schools were then checked by mail to make sure of the date of the self-evaluation and visiting committee and of the method of preparation. A letter from the investigators with supporting recommendations from the chairman and secretary of the state committees went with the mail inquiry. The letter described the study and asked schools to indicate a willingness to participate if they were selected for the sample. Eventually, practically all schools so agreed. Mail, telephone, and a few visits by the research staff were involved in securing the necessary approvals.

Schools were assigned numbers. Stratified samples were drawn using a table of random numbers, plus a few alternates. An attempt was made to preserve a balance between Florida and Georgia according to the number of schools involved in self-study during the selected years and also equal numbers according to method of self-study. Five groups of schools were selected as follows (Groups I, II, and part of V were selected in early fall, 1965; Groups III, IV, and the remainder of V were selected in June, 1966.):

I. Twelve high schools which were involved in initial accreditation or reevaluation during the school year 1962-63.

II. Twelve high schools which were involved in initial accreditation or reevaluation during the school year 1964-65.

III. Twelve high schools which were conducting school self-evaluation studies for initial accreditation or re-evaluation during 1965-66.

IV. Twelve high schools which were conducting school self-evaluation studies for initial accreditation or re-evaluation during 1966-67.

Two high schools did not do the self-study. Their decision came too late to substitute other schools. This reduced Group IV to ten schools.

V. Twenty high schools which had either never gone through a self-evaluation, and were not preparing for one prior to 1967-68, or which had their last self-evaluation five years or more before this study and had not scheduled another self-study during the period of this investigation. Where possible, these schools were selected from the same school system as the experimental schools.

It was necessary to modify the criterion for selection slightly in some cases in order to have control schools. The requirement of five years was changed to one full year prior to the period of self-study for the experimental school for which it was a control.

The schools selected by this method are listed in Appendix A. Table 1 shows distribution of the selected schools by state and year and method of preparation.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL SCHOOLS IN FLORIDA AND GEORGIA BY YEAR AND METHOD OF PREPARATION FOR EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE

Year of Preparation	Experimental Schools					Control Schools		All Schools
	Florida			Georgia		Florida	Georgia	
	Method of Preparation							
	No Help	Consul- tants	Univ. Course	No Help	Consul- tants			
1962-63	2	2	3	4	1	3	0	15
1964-65	1	2	4	3	2	1	2	15
1965-66	0	2	4	4	2	2	4	18
1966-67	1	1	4	3	1	5	3	18
Total	4	7	15	14	6	11	9	66

Pilot Study

Two of the alternate schools from Groups I (1962-63) and II (1964-65) were selected for initial visiting and try-out of instruments. Prior to the visits to these pilot schools an interview guide was developed to use with school staff members. The interview guide was intended to get information on what curriculum changes had occurred in courses, services, and activities; whether the change was a modification, addition, or subtraction; whether the source was from the faculty during the self-study period, from the visiting committee, or from a nonrelated source; whether the change occurred before or after the visiting committee; whether the change was confined to the local school or whether it was systemwide. In addition, information was sought on visiting committee recommendations not followed and reasons why they were rejected. Interviewers also sought subjective reactions from those interviewed on (1) the self-study, (2) the consultants, (3) the visiting committee, and (4) any overall resulting curriculum changes. The interview guide as it was finally cleared through the United States Office of Education is reproduced in Appendix B.

A second instrument developed was the Teacher Opinionnaire on Curriculum Change which finally contained 77 forced-choice questions and one open-end question. The final, approved form of this instrument is displayed in Appendix C. This instrument got opinions from teachers on 15 sources of influence on curriculum change on a four-point scale from "no influence" to "very influential." Teachers also responded to 19 questions on helps and hindrances to curriculum change on a three-choice scale of "hindered," "no change," and "helped." Seventeen changes resulting from the self-study were rated similarly. Teachers made judgments about 13 consequences for the professional staff. Also included were ratings of the worth of 13 activities engaged in as a part of the self-study.

The open-end question said: "In your opinion, did the evaluation of your school make any differences in the quality of teaching in your school? If so, please describe them briefly."

Single visits to two of the pilot schools were made by the principal investigators and research assistants. Materials prepared by the school staff prior to the meeting with the visiting committee, including faculty-marked copies of the Evaluative Criteria were secured and studied. Also studied were copies of the Evaluative Criteria as checked and modified by the visiting committees, plus the reports of the visiting committees.

Principals, assistant principals, guidance directors, deans, and members of each Evaluative Criteria committee D, D-1 through D-19, and E through H were interviewed. Opinionnaires were completed by the principal, teachers, and other professional staff who had participated in the self-study. Recommendations from faculty reports and visiting committee reports were related to the interviews.

Several visits were made to the other two pilot schools, one preparing for a visiting committee, and the other school working on the recommendations which had been made by a recent visiting committee. These schools served as pilot schools for the Group IV schools, those to be observed as they prepared for the visiting committee, during the visit, and during follow-up activities.

Refinement of Instruments and Procedures

The information and experience gained in the pilot studies were used as a basis for making desired changes in the Interview Guide and Teacher Opinionnaire on Curriculum Change as well as modifying some of the data-gathering procedures. The refined instruments were cleared through the United States Office of Education. During this period, arrangements were made for visits to experimental and control schools in Groups I and II (1962-63 and 1964-65).

Collection of Data in Experimental and Control Schools

One or more research assistants plus the principal investigators visited several experimental schools from Groups I and II. As procedures were standardized it became possible either to reduce the number of interviewers in a school or to reduce the time needed in schools. Upon arriving at a school, the researchers met with the principal plus any person or persons designated by him to be responsible for the schedule during the visit. Faculty and visiting committee reports were secured and examined. A schedule was established for interviewing one person from each of the faculty committees, D through H, who had worked on the self-study. Opinionnaires were distributed to all faculty members who had been on the staff when the self-study was made. These were completed anonymously and returned before the researchers left the school. Each person picked up a card on which his name had been written as he turned in his material.. Thus it was possible to check stragglers.

Research assistants filed materials upon their return to the University. A narrative report was made of each visit. Content analyses were made of the interview data from each school.

Similar procedures were followed for Group III (1965-66) schools and their control schools. Curriculum changes reported by experimental schools were used to find out whether similar changes had occurred at the same period in the control schools.

Somewhat different procedures were followed in Group IV (1966-67) schools. Several weeks before the schools began self-studies--during the pre-school planning period when possible--research staff members visited schools and randomized the teaching faculties (excluding new appointees) into two groups. Half of the teachers took the Teacher Human Relations Questionnaire (THRQ) and the other half took the Teacher Activities Questionnaire (TAQ). In post-testing, each group took the other test. All staff members took the Curriculum Improvement Measure (CIM) with pre- and post-testing matched pairs. Samples of the THRQ, TAQ, and CIM are displayed in Appendix C.

The THRQ was developed under the title, Teacher Attitude Scale by Walker (46) to describe the attitudes and feelings of teachers toward the principal, other teachers, pupils, and other human relations aspects of their job. The version used in this study contained 90 items. Reliabilities obtained by split-halves and Kuder-Richardson methods have varied from .94 to .98. It has been used in a number of research projects at the University of Florida. Validity was based upon correlation with other instruments, predictions of observers about individuals and school faculties, and item-test correlations.

The TAQ was developed under the title, Teacher Activity Check List, by Mathews (28) to describe teacher behavior as a member of a profession, working with children, working with parents, working with administrators and supervisors, and working for professional growth. Mathews observed and interviewed 50 teachers in four different schools, then filled out the check list as she thought teachers would fill it out on themselves. The teachers did fill it out. Validity was determined by the correlations between Mathews's completion of the checklist and that of each individual teacher. These $\underline{r}$'s had a mean—following Fisher's z transformation—of .870. Item-by-item correlations, over 50 pairs of scores were completed with $\underline{r}$'s ranging from .654 to .954 with a mean $\underline{r}$, using a z-transformation, of .853. Two split-half reliability checks gave estimated test reliabilities of .892 and .949.

The CIM was developed by Duncan (13) to measure a group's readiness for curriculum change. Duncan found that there were four major discriminators, from a list of 12, between faculties with good curriculum improvement programs and those without such programs. These were: (1) awareness and acceptance of group practice, (2) awareness and interest in solving pupil and school problems, (3) understanding and acceptance of modern curriculum improvement methods, and (4) awareness of modern social problems and feeling that they can be solved by intelligence.

The CIM contained 24 items. Its reliability has been estimated at .62 to .65. Validity was established by comparing school faculty group means with prior rankings by curriculum workers close to the groups.

During May and June, following completion of the self-study and the visiting committee, faculty members took the instruments a second time. On the second administration, the persons taking the THRQ and TAQ were reversed.

During the process of the self-study in the Group IV schools, each faculty was visited five or more times by at least one research assistant. Committee and faculty meetings were observed. Some informal interviewing was done. Committee chairmen, faculty chairmen for the self-study, and other key persons were interviewed from time to time during these visits on preparatory activities. Copies of materials were collected. Following each visit, a narrative report was prepared and added to the material on each of the Group IV schools.

When the outside committee visited the Group IV schools, at least one and usually more members of the project staff were present for the entire proceedings. Meetings and activities of the visiting committee were observed closely. Copies of final reports were secured. A few weeks after the visiting committee had made its report, final interviewing was done. Curriculum changes already made were noted. Where decisions had been made not to make changes, reasons were sought. Representatives of each faculty committee were interviewed. Opinionnaires (TOCC) were administered to all staff members as was done in the Groups I, II, and III schools.

Visits to the control schools were matched to the initial and final visits to the experimental schools in Group IV. The procedure of pre- and post-instrumentation with the TAQ, THRQ, and the CIM was the same as was used in the experimental schools, i.e., randomized halves for the TAQ and THRQ, and matched pairs of all teachers for the CIM. The content of the TOCC was not appropriate to the control schools, hence was not used with them.

Data from the TOCC, from all experimental schools, and from the TAQ, THRQ, and the CIM, from Group IV experimental and control schools, were punched on IBM cards and appropriate summaries prepared prior to data analysis.

RESULTS

Three kinds of data were collected and analyzed to answer the questions raised earlier about curriculum change in high schools making self-evaluations in accordance with regional accreditation policies and of concomitant changes in selected attitudes and practices of the teachers involved. These were: (1) interview and observation data including study of faculty and visiting committee reports for all schools; (2) faculty reactions to an opinionnaire on curriculum change for all schools; (3) before and after scores on three instruments for the schools making self-studies in 1966-67. Interview data were collected from control schools for all years and before and after instrumentation was done with control schools for the 1966-67 experimental schools. The opinionnaire was not appropriate for use with the control schools since a high proportion of the questions asked were based upon the self-study, the Evaluative Criteria, and the visiting committee.

Interview and Observation Data on Curriculum Change

An average of 15 persons was interviewed from the faculty of each of the 46 schools studied. The questioning included a check on changes recommended by the visiting committee in its written report. Eighteen of the control schools provided usable interview data. A check was made in the control schools for changes reported by or recommended to experimental schools. Initial recording of interview data was done on the forms shown in Appendix B.

A second form, Summary of Interviews, was used to make a content analysis of the interview data. It is shown in Appendix D. Changes were classified as to whether they were courses, services, or activities. They were also classified as to modifications, additions, or subtractions. The form made possible a comparison between kind of change and area of change,(for example, agriculture, art, mathematics, guidance services, activity program) between experimental schools and their controls. For the experimental schools, it was possible to record whether the change had originated with the faculty, the visiting committee, or the school system as a whole. Also recorded was whether modifications were changes in course content, nature of a service, or activity, whether modification was one of means, personnel, materials, or equipment, or whether it involved change in organization for instruction as adding team teaching or independent study. Research assistants made judgments as to whether changes seemed positively related to attaining the objectives of the school, did not influence such attainment, or militated against attainment of objectives. Finally changes were judged as major or minor by the interviewer.

Summaries were made from these analyses for each school and are reported in Tables 2 to 10.

Curriculum change occurs more often in schools making a self-study than in similar schools not so engaged. In 46 experimental schools, 1379 curriculum changes were reported, a mean of 30.0 per school. The 18 control schools reported 356 changes during the same time periods, a mean of 19.8. Thus changes occur about 50 percent more often in schools doing self-evaluations. See Appendix E, Tables E-2 and E-3.

The number of curriculum changes varies according to the method of self-study. Eighteen schools which had no outside help during their self-study reported 426 changes, with a mean of 23.7 per school. The 13 schools with outside consultative help reported 395 changes, or a mean of 30.4 per school. The 15 schools which had faculty members registered for the university laboratory course reported 558 changes, or a mean of 37.2 per school.

Schools with consultative help had 26.6 percent more changes than schools without outside consultants. Schools with university courses had 22.4 percent more changes than schools with consultative help, and 57.0 percent more changes than schools without outside help.

The mean for the control schools for the schools without outside help was 18.9 changes per school; for those with consultative help, 19.8; for those working for course credit, 21.0. The schools without outside help made 25.4 percent more changes than their controls. Those with outside help made 52.0 percent more changes than their controls. The schools with university courses exceeded their controls by 77.1 percent in curriculum changes reported. See Appendix E, Table E-3.

What kind of changes are the additional 10.2 which occurred in the experimental schools? If there were an average experimental school, the differences between it and an average control school would be as follows:

6.9 course changes in which 4.7 courses were modified, 2.0 courses were added, and 0.2 courses were dropped.
2.0 changes in pupil services made up of 1.3 modifications, 0.6 additional services, and 0.1 services dropped.
1.3 changes in pupil activities made up of 0.9 activities modified, 0.4 activities added, and no activities dropped.
6.6 of the changes were faculty initiated.
3.2 changes followed visiting committee recommendations.
0.4 changes originated elsewhere--the school system, the state department of education, or the federal government.
9.0 of the changes were judged by the researchers to have a positive influence on the attainment of objectives.
1.0 were judged neutral in relation to objectives.

0.2 were thought to have a negative influence on attainment of objectives.
2.9 of the 10.2 changes were judged major changes.
7.3 were thought to be minor changes.

Why were some committee recommendations for curriculum change rejected? The typical experimental school would have said "no" to 30.9 changes, almost the same number of rejections as the 30.0 changes made. The reasons are summarized in Table 2. The reason most often given for rejecting a recommendation was that the faculty disagreed with the recommendation. Next most frequent reason leading to rejection was lack of money. Space and facilities and disagreement by the administration followed. Suitable personnel not available on the faculty and personnel not generated by ADA were listed separately, though together they would have been high as a reason. Lack of demand for the course, for example a third or fourth year of a foreign language, was near the bottom, given slightly more frequently than difficulty in scheduling. Lack of materials was reported at the bottom and was given only about two percent of the time. In 154 instances, about one case in seven, the reason for rejection was unknown to the persons interviewed.

The number of rejections tended to increase over the first three groups, going from a mean of 21.6 in 1962-63, to 31.4 in 1964-65, and 40.0 for 1965-66. Likewise there was some variation reported in the ranks of reasons for rejection. Lack of available personnel was first in Group I. Faculty disagreement was first for Group II. Finance was the most important reason for Group III. Rank-difference correlations were .86, .78, and .83, all significant. Likewise, the three rank difference correlations among the three methods of preparation were also significant at .80, .75, and .82. The average number of rejections was much higher among the schools with consultants, averaging 39.7 against the 24.9 rejections in the schools without help, and 23.0 rejections in the schools whose teachers enrolled in a university course.

How do the changes relate to type of preparation? If the differences between the experimental schools by each of the three types of preparation and their control schools are broken down, they are distributed as in Table 3. Two things should be noted in the origin of recommendations. For the 1962-63 group, the visiting committee recommended 9.0 changes. By 1966-67 only 0.5 were reported, whereas those changes originating with the school staff had increased from 6.8 to 8.8. It could be that after the lapse of time, those interviewed did not remember accurately. For the 1966-67 group, most of the changes reported were those which had taken place in the school before the visiting committee had made recommendations. Also apparent is the increase in changes from the no help schools to those with consultants to those with college courses. Do systems which encourage change tend to use the university course approach more often? Do the college persons work with the school staffs to select more creative individuals on the visiting

TABLE 2

NUMBER AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRICULUM CHANGE REJECTED IN 36 SCHOOLS BY RANK OF REASONS FOR REJECTION, YEAR OF PREPARATION, AND METHOD OF PREPARATION FOR SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE

Reasons for Rejecting Recommendations	All Schools (36)			Year of Preparation						Method of Preparation					
				(12) 1962-63		(12) 1964-65		(12) 1965-66		(15) No Help		(10) Consult.		(11) Course	
	Rank	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.
Faculty disagrees	1	189	5.3	38	3.2	73	6.1	78	6.5	64	4.3	65	6.5	60	4.0
Finances	2	173	4.8	37	3.1	47	3.9	89	7.4	51	3.4	71	7.1	51	3.4
Not known	3	154	4.3	24	2.0	50	4.2	80	6.7	40	2.7	60	6.0	54	3.6
Space and facilities	4	150	4.2	36	3.0	52	4.3	62	5.2	44	2.9	63	6.3	43	2.9
Adm. disagrees	5	142	3.9	59	5.0	28	2.3	55	4.6	63	4.2	42	4.2	37	2.5
Personnel not available	6	117	3.3	23	7.9	43	3.7	51	4.3	44	2.9	48	4.8	25	1.7
No demand	7	63	1.8	11	0.9	24	2.0	28	2.3	22	1.5	23	2.3	18	1.2
Personnel-ADA[a]	8.5	51	1.4	15	1.3	23	1.9	13	1.1	14	0.9	11	1.1	26	1.7
Schedules	8.5	51	1.4	6	0.5	33	2.7	12	1.0	20	1.3	5	0.5	26	1.7
Materials	10	24	0.7	7	0.6	4	0.3	13	1.1	11	0.7	9	0.9	4	0.3
Totals		1114	30.9	256	21.6	377	31.4	481	40.0	373	24.9	397	39.7	344	31.3

[a] Average daily attendance of pupils insufficient to increase staffing

TABLE 3

MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NUMBER OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY VISITING COMMITTEE IN EXCESS OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN 18 CONTROL SCHOOLS NOT UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY VISITING COMMITTEE BY YEAR AND METHOD OF PREPARATION BY SELECTED CATEGORIES

Curriculum Changes	Mean Difference in Number of Curriculum Changes between Experimental and Control Schools						
	Year of Preparation				Method of Preparation		
	1962-63	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	No Help	Consultant	University Course
Origin of Recommend.:							
School Staff	6.8	6.1	7.8	8.8	3.2	7.3	10.8
System Staff	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.7
Visiting Committee	9.0	2.7	3.0	0.5	1.4	2.8	4.7
Relation to School's Stated Purpose:							
Facilitating	14.2	8.0	9.9	9.1	4.1	9.2	14.0
No Influence	1.9	0.9	1.3	0.4	0.6	1.0	2.0
Hindering	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
Quality of Change:							
Major	5.0	2.7	2.9	2.7	1.3	3.0	4.2
Minor	11.3	6.3	8.5	7.0	3.5	7.4	12.0

committees? Do they also help the school faculties to see more opportunities for change?

Were the number of changes related to the size of the school? Rank-difference correlations were calculated between the enrollment and number of reported curriculum changes for the schools by year of self-study. The rank-difference correlations for the first three groups were -.24, .27, and .32. For the schools making the self-study in 1966-67, the correlation was .62. The latter approaches significance at the .05 level of confidence and is based upon changes made during the year of the self-study.

What happens to the courses, services, and activities from the time a high school starts a self-evaluation until it has taken action on the recommendations of the visiting committee? While more changes do occur and while the method of preparation seems to make a difference, what has been reported thus far is the part of the iceberg that shows above the water. The 1379 curriculum changes reported by the 46 experimental schools can first be divided into course changes, service changes, and activity changes. Nine hundred thirty-six course changes or 67.9 percent of the total are reported; the 274 service changes make up 19.9 percent of all changes; the remainder, 169 activity changes, accounts for the last 12.2 percent.

Schools whose faculties were enrolled in university courses reported 581 changes, those with no help, 427 changes, and the schools with consultants, 371 changes. Regardless of the method of preparation, the percent of changes in courses, services, and activities varies but little among these three types of preparation.

Percent of change among courses, services, and activities, is fairly uniform for Group I (1962-63), II (1964-65), and III (1965-66). However many of the recommended course changes could not be done until the following year for Group IV (1966-67) schools, and their percent of course changes to the end of the year was only 57.4 while service changes made up 25.2 percent of all changes and changes in activities 17.4 percent of all changes.

The changes in courses, services, and activities can again be classified as modifications, additions, or subtractions. Not many courses, services, or activities get dropped. For all schools involved, only 30 courses, 6 services, and 3 activities were eliminated in the four groups studied. Modifications occurred more than twice as often as additions. During the period covered by the study, 701 courses were modified while 205 were added. The frequencies were closer for services, 159 modifications to 109 additions. The trend was reversed with 69 activity modifications to 97 additions. See Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 4
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Curriculum Changes	Method of Preparation						Total All Years	
	No Help		Consultants		Course			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Courses	291	68.1	266	71.7	379	65.2	936	67.9
Services	84	19.7	71	19.1	119	20.5	274	19.9
Activities	52	12.2	34	9.2	83	14.3	169	12.2
Totals	427	100.0	371	100.0	581	100.0	1379	100.0

TABLE 5
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY YEAR OF PREPARATION

Curriculum Changes	Year of Preparation								Total All Years	
	1962-63		1964-65		1965-66		1966-67			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Courses	247	72.0	242	69.0	308	69.6	139	57.4	936	67.9
Services	57	16.6	77	21.9	79	17.8	61	25.2	274	19.9
Activities	39	11.4	32	9.1	56	12.6	42	17.4	169	12.2
Totals	343	100.0	351	100.0	443	100.0	242	100.0	1379	100.0

In looking at all changes which occur in the experimental schools, the 30.0 divide into 20.3 course changes, 6.0 service changes, and 3.7 activity changes. About three-fourths of the course changes (15.2) are modifications, about one-fifth (4.4) are new courses, and less than one-twentieth (0.7) are deletions. Service changes run 3.5 modifications, 2.4 additions, and 0.1 subtractions. The activities include 1.5 modifications, 2.1 additions, and 0.1 deletions.

Schools taking university courses make the most changes in each area, followed by schools with consultants. The schools with the university courses report 25.2 course changes against 20.4 for consultants and 16.1 for the schools without help. However, their margin is almost wholly from course modifications. In services, the changes reported are 7.9, 5.5, and 4.6, respectively, with the margin here coming largely from service additions. The activity changes run in the same order, 5.5, 2.6, and 2.9. Here, the university course schools report 3.6 additions against 1.4 for each of the other methods of preparation. Modifications and subtractions are closer together.

There is considerable similarity in patterns of changes by year of preparation except that 1965-66 seems to have had substantially more course changes and activity changes than other years. See Table 6.

TABLE 6

MEAN NUMBER OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN INTERVIEWS BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY YEAR AND METHOD OF PREPARATION

Changes in Curriculum	Year of Preparation				Method of Prep.			
	1962-1963	1964-1965	1965-1966	1966-1967	No Help	Consult.	Course	All Schools
Courses:								
Modified	13.7	14.9	20.6	11.1	11.7	14.9	19.7	15.2
Added	6.4	4.3	4.3	2.5	3.8	5.0	4.7	4.4
Subtracted	0.5	1.0	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.7
Total	20.6	20.2	25.7	13.9	16.1	20.4	25.2	20.3
Services:								
Modified	2.9	3.3	4.1	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.9	3.5
Added	1.8	3.2	2.3	2.1	1.4	2.1	3.7	2.4
Subtracted	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1
Total	4.7	6.5	6.6	6.1	4.6	5.5	7.9	6.0
Activities:								
Modified	2.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.2	1.8	1.5
Added	1.2	1.3	3.3	2.8	1.4	1.4	3.6	2.1
Subtracted	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Total	3.3	2.7	4.7	4.2	2.9	2.6	5.5	3.7

There are some significant differences between observed and expected frequencies when changes are categorized by method of preparation and subjected to a chi-square test. Frequencies for origin of changes, contribution to purposes of the school, whether the modification is one of content, means, or organization, and whether the change is judged major or minor are reported in Table 7. For origin of changes, those schools with consultant help are higher than expectation for visiting committee recommendations and lower than expectation for recommendations from the school. This group of schools contributes more to the total chi-square than either of the other two methods of preparation. Overall, chi-square is significant between .02 and .05.

The frequencies were relatively low on negative or neutral contributions to purposes of the school so these were grouped. The resulting chi-square was significant well below .001. Much of the difference was contributed by more positive contributions than expected from the consultant schools and less than expected from the university course schools.

On modifications, the chi-square was again significant with a probability of less than .001. The no help and university course schools were above and below expectation, respectively, on means changes, and below and above expectation on organization changes.

The differences between observed and expected changes in distributions of changes as major and minor could occur by chance between five and 10 percent of the time, and hence were not judged as being significantly related to the type of preparation.

How were changes related to the subcommittees of the Evaluative Criteria? A distribution of reported changes as they fit into the various subcommittees, D through H including all relevant D-1 through D-19 subcommittees is shown in Table 8. The D committee refers to the program of studies as a whole. D-1, D-2, and so on are subject-area subcommittees. While boys' and girls' physical education are listed separately in the *Criteria*, they are combined in the table because on some occasions self-study and reporting by the visiting committee made it impossible to separate changes. The other committees are E, student activities; F, instructional materials, library, and audio-visual; G, guidance services; and H, health services.

More changes, 112, were made under student activities than any other subcommittee except English.

Subcommittees E through H included 26.7 percent (368) of all changes.

TABLE 7

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO SELECTED QUESTIONS ON CURRICULUM CHANGES IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Curriculum Changes	Observed Frequency of Response			Expected Frequency of Response		
	Method of Prep.			Method of Prep.		
	No Help	Con-sult.	Univ. Course	No Help	Con-sult.	Univ. Course
Origin:						
School	302	252	399	294	273	386
Visiting Committee	124	143	159	132	122	172
	Chi-square = 7.37			$P < .05$		
Contribution to Purpose:						
Positive	369	377	475	377	350	494
Neutral or Negative	57	18	83	48	45	64
	Chi-square = 26.84			$P < .001$		
Modification of:						
Content	97	88	121	98	90	118
Means	143	102	107	112	104	136
Organization	55	82	129	85	78	103
	Chi-square = 32.12			$P < .001$		
Quality of Change:						
Major	118	128	145	121	112	158
Minor	308	267	413	305	283	400
	Chi-square = 4.64			$.10 > P > .05$		

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

Subcommittees of Evaluative Criteria		Rank	Number All Schools	Number by Year of Preparation			
				1962-63	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67
D-7	English	1	142	37	41	47	17
E	Student Activity	2	112	17	27	40	28
F	Instr. Mat.-Libr	3	107	27	29	28	23
G	Guidance	4	104	25	31	32	16
D-12	Mathematics	5	103	27	24	35	17
D-14 & 15	P. E.	6	96	15	24	33	24
D-17	Science	7	91	25	28	24	14
D-13	Music	8	82	22	17	30	13
D-8	Foreign Language	9	79	23	20	22	14
D-18	Social Studies	10	78	24	19	26	9
D-3	Business Ed.	11	75	24	19	23	9
D-10	Home Economics	12	61	18	15	16	12
D-11	Indust. Arts	13	50	14	5	24	7
H	Health Service	14	45	12	10	9	14
D-2	Art	15	44	7	11	19	7
D	Prog. of Studies	16	32	9	1	10	12
D-1	Agriculture	17	30	7	12	10	1
D-6	Driver Education	18	20	6	8	3	3
D-9	Health Education	19	17	1	5	10	1
D-5	Distrib. Educ.	20	8	3	2	2	1
D-16	Religion	21	3	0	3	0	0

Among the program of studies subcommittees, more changes were reported in English (142) than any other subject area. Mathematics followed English with 103 changes, science had 91, and social studies, 78. Combined physical education included 96 changes, foreign languages, 79, slightly less than music's 82. Business education reported 75 changes.

Listed under committee H, health services, and D-9, health education were 45 and 17 changes, respectively. Changes under committee F, instructional materials, library, and audio-visual, and in committee G, guidance, were 107 and 104, putting them ahead of all academic subjects except English.

How do teachers say they feel about elements of the evaluation process when they are interviewed? Teachers were asked to comment on how they felt about the self-study, their consultants, if any, the work of the visiting committee, and any curriculum changes which came about because of the self-study or visiting committee. Their reactions were categorized as positive, neutral, or negative. They are reported by year of preparation in Table 9 and by method of preparation in Table 10. Not all teachers interviewed commented on each category and the school staffs with no consultative help did not comment on the consultants. Responses are reported by frequency and by school mean.

In most instances the responses were more often favorable than neutral or negative. Eighty-three percent of the 651 persons rating the self-study reacted positively to it. This was the best rating of the four elements. Next in line was the view of the visiting committee which received 74 percent of the 646 comments as positive. Respondents were less satisfied with the changes they had made. Almost exactly two of every three, 66 percent, of the 636 who responded indicated satisfaction. The consultants, by a slight margin, received the lowest rating, 64 percent of the 359 comments made in this area.

A chi-square analysis was made of the comments by method of preparation and by years of preparation. Neutral and negative responses were combined. A chi-square as large as or larger than that found on the self-study would occur by chance between 30 and 50 percent of the time. Hence method of preparation did not seem related to satisfaction with the self-study. See Table 11.

A chi-square equal to or exceeding that found on the consultant judgments would occur by chance less than two percent of the time. Hence the judgments were different here, with the teachers taking university work to help prepare having the more favorable judgments.

TABLE 9

NUMBER AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN 46 SCHOOLS REACTING TO SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN INTERVIEW BY YEAR OF PREPARATION AND CATEGORY OF REACTION[a]

Elements of Evaluation Process	Year of Preparation														
	1962-63(12)			1964-65(12)			1965-66(12)			1966-67(10)			All Schools (46)		
	+	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	-
Self-Study:															
Number	104	7	16	151	5	12	157	10	26	130	14	19	542	36	73
Average	8.7	0.6	1.3	12.6	0.4	1.0	13.1	0.8	2.2	13.0	1.4	1.9	11.8	0.8	1.6
Consultants:															
Number	45	7	12	47	30	21	74	20	25	63	11	4	229	68	62
Average	3.8	0.6	1.0	3.9	2.5	1.8	6.2	1.7	2.1	6.3	1.1	0.4	5.0	1.5	1.3
Visiting Comm.:															
Number	95	8	23	118	26	22	140	36	15	126	14	23	479	84	83
Average	8.0	0.7	1.9	9.9	2.2	1.8	11.7	3.0	1.3	12.6	1.4	2.3	10.4	1.8	1.8
Curric. Changes:															
Number	85	27	15	105	45	10	130	36	27	101	39	23	421	147	75
Average	7.1	2.3	1.3	8.8	3.8	0.8	10.8	3.0	2.3	10.1	3.9	2.3	9.2	3.2	1.6

[a] Reaction Categories:
+ = reacts positively
0 = reacts neutrally
- = reacts negatively

TABLE 10

NUMBER AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN 46 SCHOOLS REACTING TO SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN INTERVIEW BY METHOD OF PREPARATION AND CATEGORY OF REACTION[a]

Elements of Evaluation Process	Method of Preparation											
	No Help(18)			Consult.(13)			Univ.Course(15)			All Schools (46)		
	+	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	-
Self-Study:												
Number	205	15	21	146	3	18	191	18	34	542	36	73
Average	11.4	0.8	1.2	11.2	0.2	1.4	12.7	1.2	2.3	11.8	0.8	1.6
Consultants:												
Number	xx	xx	xx	64	35	17	165	33	45	229	68	62
Average	xx	xx	xx	4.9	2.7	1.3	11.0	2.2	3.0	5.0	1.5	1.3
Visiting Comm.:												
Number	173	39	28	128	11	21	178	34	32	479	84	81
Average	9.6	2.2	1.6	9.8	0.8	1.6	11.9	2.3	2.1	10.4	1.8	1.8
Curric. Changes:												
Number	142	61	38	111	38	14	168	48	23	421	147	75
Average	7.9	3.4	2.1	8.5	2.9	1.1	11.2	3.2	1.5	9.2	3.2	1.6

[a] Reaction Categories: + = Reacts positively
0 = Reacts neutrally
- = Reacts negatively

TABLE 11

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCY OF REACTIONS TO ELEMENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Elements of Evaluation	Observed Frequency			Expected Frequency		
	Method of Preparation					
	No Help	Consult	Course	No Help	Consult	Course
Self-Study:						
Positive	205	146	191	204	141	197
Neutral & Neg.	36	21	42	37	26	36
	Chi-square = 2.354 .50> P > .30					
Consultants:						
Positive	xx	64	165	xx	74	155
Neutral & Neg.	xx	52	78	xx	42	88
	Chi-square = 5.513 P< .02					
Visiting Committee:						
Positive	173	128	178	179	118	181
Neutral & Neg.	67	31	66	61	41	63
	Chi-square = 4.270 .20> P > .10					
Curric. Change:						
Positive	142	111	168	158	107	156
Neutral & Neg.	99	52	71	83	56	83
	Chi-square = 7.798 .05 >P> .02					

Judgments were close to expectation on the visiting committee and deviations from expectation this large or larger could be expected between 10 and 20 percent of the time if only chance were operating. On curriculum change, those taking the field laboratory course reacted significantly more favorably than either of the other groups. The probability of a chi-square equal to or exceeding that obtained was between 5 percent and 2 percent.

Apparently distance in time has some relationship to sentiments about the elements of the evaluation. Significant differences were reported for the self-study and for the consultants. Respondents from Groups II and IV tended to have more favorable feelings about these two elements than respondents for Groups I and III. There were no differences of consequence by year for feelings toward visiting committee or curriculum changes made. See Table 12.

Teacher Opinions on Curriculum Change

The Teacher Opinionnaire on Curriculum Change was completed by 1714 teachers from 46 experimental schools. All responses were punched on IBM cards and frequency distributions were made for all 77 items by individual schools; by type of preparation; by year; by type of preparation by year; and by total for all schools. Means were also calculated for each item for each of the above categories. Frequency distributions for the all-schools category and item means are listed in Appendix F.

The TOCC had four sections with one section divided into two parts. These sections were ratings of: (1) persons and organized groups which teachers felt influenced curriculum change in the individual school; (2) helps and hindrances to curriculum change within the school; (3) changes that resulted from the self-study in (a) the program of the school and (b) the professional staff; and (4) elements of the evaluation which helped or hindered curriculum change. The sections are reported in order. The first section had a four-point scale from "no influence" to "very influential" plus a "not applicable" response.

Means and ranks of 15 selected factors thought to influence curriculum change are reported in Tables 13 and 14. It might be thought that all teachers doing a self-study would feel that the administrative staff and the faculty of the school had something to do with curriculum change yet 29 and 20 teachers, respectively, reported these as not applicable. National curriculum revision groups and civil rights activities of the U. S. government were viewed as not applicable by 292 (17 percent) and 234 (13.6 percent), respectively. Approximately 10 percent had similar views of consultants from outside the system, lay groups, state legislatures, and professional organizations. Five percent or less felt that supervisors and resource persons, state departments of education,

TABLE 12

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OBSERVED AND EXPECTED FREQUENCY OF REACTIONS TO ELEMENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS BY YEAR OF PREPARATION

Elements of Evaluation	Observed Frequency				Expected Frequency			
	Year of Preparation				Year of Preparation			
	1962-63	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1962-63	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67
Self-Study:								
Positive	104	151	157	130	99	142	163	138
Neutral and Negative	13	17	36	33	18	26	30	25
	Chi-square = 9.757			.05> P > .02				
Consultants:								
Positive	45	47	74	63	41	63	76	50
Neutral and Negative	19	51	45	15	23	35	43	28
	Chi-square = 22.025			P < .001				
Visiting Committee:								
Positive	95	118	140	126	93	123	142	121
Neutral and Negative	31	48	51	37	33	43	49	42
	Chi-square = 1.860			.70 > P > .50				
Curriculum Change:								
Positive	85	105	130	101	83	105	126	107
Neutral and Negative	42	55	63	62	44	55	67	56
	Chi-square = 1.484			.70 > P > .50				

TABLE 13

IMPACT OF SELECTED FACTORS ON CURRICULUM CHANGE AS RATED[a] BY 1714 TEACHERS FROM 46 SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY YEAR AND BY TYPE OF PREPARATION

Influencing Factors	Means							
	All Schools	Year of Evaluation				Type of Preparation		
		62-63	64-65	65-66	66-67	No Help	Consult.	Course
Administrative staff of own school	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Administrative staff of school system	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.0	1.9
Southern Association of Colleges & Schools	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.9
Faculty	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.0
State Department of Education	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7
Guidance staff	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
Supervisors and resource persons	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5
Federal support	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.5
Testing programs	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.4
National curriculum groups (BSCS, etc.)	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.4
State legislature	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3
Consultants outside the system	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.1
Professional organizations	1.1	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1
Civil rights activities of U. S. Government	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.0
Lay groups	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8

[a] Scale: 0-3, 0 meaning "no influence"; 3, "very influential"

TABLE 14

IMPACT OF SELECTED FACTORS ON CURRICULUM CHANGE AS RATED BY 1714 TEACHERS FROM 46 SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY RANKS BY YEAR AND BY TYPE OF PREPARATION

Influencing Factors	RANKS							
	All Schools	Year of Evaluation				Type of Preparation		
		62-63	64-65	65-66	66-67	No Help	Consult.	Univ. Course
Administrative staff of own school	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	1	1
Administrative staff of school system	2	4	4.5	2	2	1.5	4.5	3.5
Southern Association of Colleges & Schools	3.5	2.5	3	3.5	3	3.5	2.5	3.5
Faculty	3.5	2.5	2	3.5	4.5	5	2.5	2
State Department of Education	5	5	4.5	5	4.5	3.5	4.5	5.5
Guidance staff	6	6	6	7.5	6	6	6.5	5.5
Supervisors and resource persons	7.5	10.5	10	6	7	7	8.5	7.5
Federal support	7.5	7	7	7.5	8	8	6.5	7.5
Testing programs	9	8.5	8	9.5	10	9.5	8.5	9.5
National curriculum groups (BSCS, etc.)	10.5	10.5	10	9.5	10	11	10	9.5
State legislature	10.5	8.5	10	12	10	9.5	11	11
Consultants outside the system	12	13	13	12	12	13	12	12.5
Professional organizations	13.5	14	13	12	13.5	13	13.5	12.5
Civil rights activities of U. S. Government	13.5	12	13	14	13.5	13	13.5	14
Lay groups	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15

the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the administrative staff of the school system, testing programs, and the guidance staff within the school were not applicable to curriculum change.

When factors were ranked there was a remarkable similarity among reports regardless of the year of evaluation or the method of preparation. Even when means were tabulated by type of preparation within the four different years in which the evaluations occurred, ranks were remarkably constant. A series of rank-difference correlations among rankings of factors yielded R's between .86 and .98. Few of the ratings ever varied more than two or three tenths of a point. The administrative staff of the person's own school received mean ratings of 2.3 in practically every category. It was either ranked or tied for first in all categories. Other factors viewed as strong influences were the administrative staff of the school system, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and the faculty making the self-study. The state department of education ran a close fifth with means from 1.7 to 2.0, and an overall mean of 1.9.

Guidance staff, supervisors and resource persons, federal support, and testing programs were in the middle as sources of influence. Legislatures tied for tenth as an influence in the judgment of those responding. Consultants from outside the system were reported as having only a modest impact on change as were professional organizations, civil rights activities of the U. S. government, and lay groups.

In the second section of the TOCC, 17 facilities, resources, and activities were listed for teachers to rate as "hindered," "no change," or "helped" curriculum change. Of the 17 items listed, eleven were thought not applicable by from one of every eight to three of every ten teachers. Noncredit faculty study projects (the self-study might be one of these) was so rated by 30.6 percent, parent-faculty committees by 28.7 percent, school surveys by outside agencies by 28.0 percent, action research in one's own school by 21.8 percent, visiting other schools by 20.4 percent, and community survey by the school by 20.1 percent. Workshops, NSF and NDEA institutes, faculty planning and in-service training days, systemwide curriculum planning, and review of research by others drew from 18.8 to 13.3 percent "not applicable" ballots.

Not only were items rated with remarkable similarity from year to year and by method of preparation, but at first glance, different items seemed not to be clearly differentiated in the minds of raters. In quantifying responses, only "hindered," "no change," and "helped" were considered in calculating means. These were assigned 1, 2, and 3 points, respectively. Had ratings been confined to "no change" and "helped" a mean of 2.8 would mean that eight persons thought it helped for every two who felt that the factor brought about no change. Hence it was possible to interpret responses in terms of the equivalent of how many persons in ten felt that the item helped. This was done and the results are reported in Table 15. This table and the succeeding 3 tables are based upon those teachers who thought the item was applicable.

Eight of ten teachers making ratings felt that curriculum change was helped by faculty involvement in curriculum decisions, faculty committees, and NSF and NDEA institutes. Faculty meetings with the principal, university or college work, system-wide curriculum planning and action research in school were seen as helping by 7 of 10. Six of every ten thought that visiting other schools, workshops, faculty planning and in-service training days, community survey by the school, school survey by outside agency, pre-school planning conferences, and review of published research helped. Respondents were evenly divided on noncredit faculty study projects and availability of qualified teaching personnel, 5 of 10 raters supporting each. Parent-faculty committees and adequacy of physical facilities drew only 4 and 3 votes, respectively, from each 10. Again, there was unusual similarity among years and according to method of self-study.

The patterns reported for changes in the program of the school because of the self-evaluation are reported in a similar table. See Table 14. Far fewer teachers saw these items as "not applicable." No item received appreciably more than 6 percent of NA replies. The same pattern of similarity appears by different methods of preparation and by different years of evaluation. Increased library materials was reported as an outcome more often than anything else. Audio-visual aids increased according to 7 of 10 teachers. Apparently this takes time for the earliest schools evaluated most often reported an increase, and in the last year studied, only 5 of 10 teachers reported this happening. A few persons reported that class size decreased and that teachers received planning time. Other items drew from 2 to 6 of each 10 votes. See Table 16.

Somewhat less impact was reported for the effect of the evaluation upon the position and relations of teachers. Five percent or fewer reported items as "not applicable." With the exception of attitude toward the community, not more than two points separate item ratings by years, by method of preparation, or by all schools. Two of 10 participants reported increased membership in professional organizations and increased participation in professional organizations as an outgrowth of the evaluation. Outstanding outcomes were better understanding of the school philosophy and a heightened appreciation of the contribution of other departments to the program of the school, each reported by 7 of 10 raters.

Almost 10 percent of the teachers reported that teacher attitude toward evaluation worsened because of the evaluation experience. About four percent said that teacher attitude toward the total school worsened. See Table 17.

TABLE 15

HELPS TO CURRICULUM CHANGE AS SEEN BY 1714 TEACHERS FROM 46 SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Source of Help	Number of teachers in 10[a] rating factor as "helped"							
	All Schools	-----Year of Evaluation				Method of Preparation		
		62-63	64-65	65-66	66-67	No Help	Consult.	Univ. Course
Faculty involvement in curriculum decisions	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	8
Working with other teachers	8	8	9	8	8	8	9	8
Faculty committees	8	8	8	7	8	8	8	8
NSF or NDEA institutes	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	8
Faculty meetings with the principal	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	7
University or college work	7	8	7	7	8	8	8	7
System-wide curriculum planning	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	6
Action research in school	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Visiting other schools	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	6
Workshops	6	6	6	6	7	6	7	6
Faculty planning and in-service training day	6	7	6	6	6	6	7	6
Community survey by school	6	5	6	5	6	5	6	6
School survey by outside agency	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	5
Pre-school planning conference	6	7	6	6	7	6	7	6
Review of published research	6	7	6	6	7	6	7	6
Noncredit faculty study projects	5	5	5	5	6	5	6	5
Availability of qualified teaching personnel	5	4	6	5	5	6	5	5
Parent-faculty committees	4	3	4	3	5	5	5	3
Adequacy of physical facilities	3	3	3	3	4	4	1	3

[a] Ratings are based upon each teacher making judgments on each item as (1) hindered; (2) no change; (3) helped.

TABLE 16

CHANGES IN THE PROGRAM OF THE SCHOOL RESULTING FROM THE SELF-STUDY AS RATED BY 1714 TEACHERS FROM 46 SCHOOLS BY YEAR AND BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Changes by Increased Factors	Number of Teachers in 10[a] Rating Factors Increased							
	All Schools	Year of Evaluation				Method of Preparation		
		62-63	64-65	65-66	66-67	No Help	Consult.	Univ. Course
Library materials	8	9	8	9	7	8	8	8
Audio-visual aids	7	9	7	8	5	6	7	7
Teachers trying new procedures	7	8	8	8	7	7	8	7
Relationship to philosophy	6	6	7	6	6	6	7	6
Elective courses	6	7	6	4	6	5	6	6
Cooperative faculty planning	6	6	7	7	6	6	7	6
Students' use of library	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	5
Quality of audio-visual aids	6	8	5	7	4	5	6	6
Guidance services	5	8	7	6	3	4	6	5
Freedom to choose courses	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	4
Extracurricular activities	4	5	3	4	3	3	4	4
Participation in extra-curricular activities	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4
Health services	3	4	4	2	3	2	3	4
Uniformity of grading	2	4	2	2	1	2	4	2
Courses required for graduation	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0
Planning time for teachers	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
Decreased class size	1	1	-1[b]	2	0	0	-1[b]	-1[b]

[a] Ratings based upon each teacher making judgments on each item as (1) decreased; (2) no change; (3) increased

[b] Indicates increase in class size

TABLE 17

CHANGES IN THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF RESULTING FROM THE SELF-STUDY AS RATED BY 1714 TEACHERS FROM 48 SCHOOLS BY YEAR AND BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Improved Position of Teachers	Number of Teachers in 10[a] Rating Factors Improved							
	All Schools	Year of Evaluation				Method of Preparation		
		62-63	64-65	65-66	66-67	No Help	Consult.	Univ. Course
Understanding school philosophy	7	6	8	7	7	7	7	7
Appreciation of other departments	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7
Attitude toward total school	5	4	5	5	5	5	6	5
Attitude toward teaching	5	4	6	5	5	5	6	4
Attitude toward other teachers	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5
Agreement with school philosophy	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
Teaching by school philosophy	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	5
Relationship to principal	4	3	5	4	3	4	4	4
Attitude toward pupils	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3
Attitude toward evaluation	4	3	5	4	5	5	6	2
Attitude toward community	3	1	4	3	4	3	4	3
Membership in professional organizations	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	2
Participation in professional organizations	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2

[a] Ratings based upon each teacher making judgments on each item as (1) worsened; (2) no change; (3) improved.

Teachers responded to various elements of the evaluation as to whether they thought the element helped or hindered curriculum change. Responses to the 13 items are reported in Table 18. Almost no parts were reported as hindering change. Several items, including serving on the D (program of studies) committees were listed as "not applicable" by more than 10 percent of the teachers. The follow-up study of the graduates was so listed by 28.8 percent, the study of drop-outs by 21.5 percent, post-visitation committee meetings by 21.5 percent, and post-visitation faculty meetings by 13.5 percent. Serving on committees on school plant and school staff and administration was considered "not applicable" by 19.8 percent, serving on the committees on guidance, instructional materials, health service, and student activities by 14.1 percent, and serving on the program of studies committees by 12.6 percent.

For those who did see the elements as influential, the written recommendations of the visiting committees was rated as "helped" by 8 of 10 teachers from all schools and by either 8 or 9 teachers in each year of evaluation and by each method of preparation. Serving on D committees and on E to H committees drew support of 8 of 10 teachers from all schools and either 7 of 10 or 8 of 10 in different years of evaluation and by different methods of preparation.

Developing the school's philosophy, studying the pupil population, serving on I and J committees, visits by the visiting committee, and the oral reports of visiting committees were supported by 7 of 10 teachers as helping. All other elements were rated as helpful by 6 of each 10 voting. The oral reports of the visiting committees received about the same support--7 of 10--from individual schools, including schools where the research team thought the reports were brief or superficial.

A content analysis was made of the replies to the open-end item. "In your opinion, did the evaluation of your school make any differences in the quality of teaching in your school? If so, please describe them briefly." The replies of 900 teachers who responded to the question were categorized as to whether they thought the evaluation had made a difference in the quality of teaching in the school or had made no difference in the quality of teaching. These replies are summarized in Table 19 for all schools, by year of evaluation, and by method of preparation. A chi-square was calculated for the distribution of responses by year of evaluation and another by method of preparation. The slight differences by year of preparation were not significantly different from chance. Responses were different by method of preparation beyond the one percent level. Teachers from schools with consultant help reported differences slightly more frequently than expected and teachers from schools with university courses reported differences less often than expected.

TABLE 18

INFLUENCE OF SELECTED ELEMENTS OF THE SELF-STUDY ON CURRICULUM CHANGE AS RATED BY 1714 TEACHERS IN 46 SCHOOLS BY YEAR AND BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

	Number of Teachers in 10[a] Rating Factors Helped							
	All Schools	Year of Evaluation				Method of Preparation		
		62-63	64-65	65-66	66-67	No Help	Consult.	Univ. Course
Written recommendations of visiting committee	8	8	9	9	8	9	9	8
Serving on "D" Committees[b]	8	7	8	8	8	7	8	7
Serving on "E"-"H" Committees[b]	8	7	8	7	8	7	8	7
Developing School's philosophy	7	6	7	7	7	7	7	7
Studying pupil population	7	6	7	7	7	6	7	7
Serving on "I"-"J" Committees[b]	7	5	7	7	7	6	7	7
Visits by the visiting committee	7	7	7	8	7	8	8	7
Oral report of visiting committee	7	7	7	8	7	7	8	7
Surveying the community	6	5	6	7	7	6	7	6
Post-visitation faculty meetings	6	6	7	6	6	7	7	5
Post-visitation committee meetings	6	6	6	6	5	6	7	5
Follow-up study of graduates	6	6	7	5	6	6	7	5
Study of drop-outs	6	6	6	5	6	6	7	5

[a] Ratings based upon each teacher making judgments on each item as (1) hindered; (2) no influence; (3) helped.

[b] Refers to study committees recommended in Evaluative Criteria.

TABLE 19

EFFECT OF SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY VISITING COMMITTEE ON QUALITY OF TEACHING AS RATED BY 900 TEACHERS IN 46 SCHOOLS IN OPEN-END RESPONSE BY YEAR AND BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Did the evaluation make any difference in the quality of teaching your school?	All Schools		Year of Evaluation								Method of Preparation					
			62-63		64-65		65-66		66-67		No Help		Consult.		Univ. Course	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Made a difference	568	63	92	65	139	67	164	64	173	59	207	66	131	70	230	58
Made no difference	332	37	50	35	70	33	93	36	119	41	107	34	57	30	168	42
TOTALS	900	100	142	100	209	100	257	100	292	100	314	100	188	100	398	100

Chi-square = 3.1332 $.50 > P > .25$

Chi-square = 9.3927 $.01 > P > .005$

Eight hundred sixty-two teachers described the differences. These are reported in 10 categories in Table 20. Several of the responses, including the one made most often--"helped to get to know total program and other teachers"--are not directly related to the quality of teaching.

Data from Testing--Curriculum Instrument Measure, Teacher Human Relations Questionnaire, and Teacher Activities Questionnaire

Answers were sought to three concomitant questions about what happens to the teachers and other school staff members who participate in a self-evaluation, including a visiting committee. While it was not known initially whether curriculum change would be accelerated or not, it was a hypothesis rather strongly held that it would be. Hence one of the questions, do persons experiencing curriculum change become more or less open to such change, or does it influence them at all? The second question grew out of a belief that when teachers or other groups work together on tasks that have meaning to them, their sentiments toward the other members of the group and their situation will tend to improve. Hence an attempt was made to assess any changes in how teachers felt about the human relations aspects of their work--about pupils, other teachers, principals and supervisors, and parents. It was also thought that teachers doing a self-study would tend to review some of the things that experts felt they should be doing and that they might make some modification in their teaching practices and other job-connected duties, particularly if they were to be observed by outsiders. Again, an attempt was made to assess changes in the frequency with which teachers carried on certain activities with pupils, with other teachers, with administrators and supervisors, with parents, and for professional growth.

Three instruments were used. The relatively short Curriculum Improvement Measure was given to all staff members very early in the 1966-67 school year before faculties had begun to work on the *Evaluative Criteria*. Tests were coded so that post-tests could be matched with pre-tests although teacher anonymity was preserved. For the other two instruments, all those who taught one or more classes (excluding new appointees) were divided into two random groups. One group took the TAQ initially and the THRQ as a post-test. The order of testing was reversed with the other random group.

This testing was done initially with 12 schools in the 1966-67 group. Four schools were selected whose staffs were taking the university field course as part of the self-study, four who had consultative help from outside their system, and four who planned to work entirely on the resources within the system. Two schools were dropped from the consultative group when they made no progress with the self-study by midyear. In addition, eight control schools were picked who were not doing a self-study and who had not been through an evaluation for at least three or four years. In most

TABLE 20

EFFECT OF SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY VISITING COMMITTEE BY CATEGORIES OF THE OPEN-END RESPONSES MADE BY 856 TEACHERS IN 46 SCHOOLS

Responses by Categories	Rank	Number	Percent
Helped to get to know total program and other teachers	1	175	20
Helped to get to know our weaknesses	2	161	19
Helped to get additional supplies and equipment	3	111	13
Helped to understand how to change courses, etc.	4	98	11
Helped to understand and use philosophy	5	83	10
Improved interpersonal relationships among staff	6	64	07
Positive action was taken on the recommendations	7	59	07
Gave direction for planning	8	50	06
Helped to see our strengths	9	45	05
Negative reaction to evaluation	10	16	02
TOTALS	xx	862	100

cases these control schools were from the same school system. The exceptions were from similar systems and had similar characteristics as to size, pupil composition, and grades served.

Hypotheses to be tested, in null form, on the CIM were:

There is no difference in changes on CIM scores between teachers in experimental schools and teachers in control schools.

The amount of change on CIM scores does not vary by type of preparation.

The difference scores were subjected to an analysis of variance as reported in the following table. (Table 21) The obtained F did not approach the 5 percent level. The hypothesis of no difference according to type of preparation was accepted.

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CIM USING DIFFERENCE SCORES

Source	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Type of help	2	59.815	2.066	n. s.
Error (within)	382	28.952		
Total	384			

A t-test was done between the difference of mean gains of experimental and control groups--0.444 point for 636 persons on a scale with a spread of 48 points. The t of 1.036 was not significant. The hypothesis of no difference between experimental and control groups was accepted.

Hypotheses to be tested on the THRQ were:

There is no difference in changes on THRQ scores between teachers in experimental schools and teachers in control schools.

The amount of change on THRQ scores does not vary by type of preparation.

The analysis of variance was somewhat more complicated this time since the experimental design called for different, unmatched persons to take the pre- and post-tests. Likewise cell frequencies were unequal and the number of experimental schools differed in one category. Since the variance design was for a mixed model, the error (within) variance could only be used for testing the significance of the interaction variance. The interaction variance was not significant, so interaction variance was combined with the within variance to form a new error term of 716.646 with 568 degrees of freedom. The results are summarized in Table 22.

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THRQ WITH CONTROL SCHOOLS INCLUDED

Source	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Types	3	23399.44	32.65	.01
Pre-Post	1	11051.92	15.42	.01
Interaction	3	555.87	.77	n. s.
Error (within)	565	717.49		
Total	572			

The control schools were included as a fourth preparation type. Since the interaction F is not significant both hypotheses of no difference can be accepted. There is no difference in changes between experimental and control schools. There is no difference in change by type of preparation. For all schools there was a significant loss between initial and final testing. There are significant differences among preparation types both in the beginning and at the end of the study. But the differences in amounts of change are not significant.

Means by schools for pre- and post-tests with changes are reported in Table 23. Experimental and control schools are listed separately. A negative change indicates a loss. Means are also reported by preparation types. Individual school means varied from 168.0 to 233.2 with both extremes found in post-tests in the experimental schools.

Four experimental schools and one control school showed slight positive changes. All other schools reported lower scores at the end of the year. Changes varied from a gain of 6.55 in a university course school to a loss of 25.52 in a consultant-assisted school. All experimental schools lost 8.68 points. The control schools dropped 9.22 points. The no help schools lost 8.82 points, the consultant-assisted schools went down 17.27, and the university course schools were off 2.97 points. All schools combined went down 8.80 points.

TABLE 23

MEANS AND CHANGE BY SCHOOLS ON PRE- AND POST-TESTS WITH THE THRQ IN 10 EXPERIMENTAL AND 8 CONTROL SCHOOLS

School Type and Preparation	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Change from Pre- to Post-Test
	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	
Experimental:					
38	7	206.9	7	206.4	- 0.5
39	11	193.9	11	190.9	- 3.0
40	19	193.5	19	168.0	-25.5
41	17	211.5	17	199.7	-11.8
42	13	228.4	13	233.2	4.8
43	19	230.0	18	209.6	-20.4
44	22	223.5	19	230.0	6.5
46	14	213.8	12	214.6	0.8
47	20	231.1	17	231.6	0.5
48	24	225.9	20	208.4	-17.4
Control Sch.:					
49	11	206.4	9	197.6	- 8.8
50	12	206.3	8	190.8	-15.5
51	18	219.8	12	213.3	- 6.5
52	29	200.2	23	196.9	- 3.3
53	15	193.6	16	194.8	1.2
54	14	196.9	12	175.1	-21.8
55	22	231.2	26	213.1	-18.1
56	15	219.2	12	210.7	- 8.4
Preparation:					
No Help	70	222.6	64	213.8	- 8.8
Consultant	30	193.6	30	176.4	-17.3
Course 682	66	223.5	59	220.6	- 2.9
All Schools:					
Experimental	166	217.7	153	209.1	- 8.7
Control	136	209.9	118	200.7	- 9.2
Combined	302	214.2	271	205.4	- 8.8

Hypotheses to be tested on the TAQ:

There is no difference in changes on TAQ scores between teachers in experimental schools and teachers in control schools.

The type of preparation for an evaluation is not related to the amount of change on TAQ scores among teachers in the three different types of preparation.

The analysis of variance was similar to that for the THRQ. When the interaction variance proved to be not significant the interaction sum of squares was combined with the error (within) sum of squares to form a new error term. The F for type, which included control schools as a type of preparation, namely, no preparation at all, was at the .01 level. See Table 24 below. Since F values for both pre- post-testing and interaction were not significant both null hypotheses are accepted.

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TAQ WITH CONTROL SCHOOLS INCLUDED

Source	d. f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Type	3	8966.758	4.529	.01
Pre-Post	1	17.703	.009	n. s.
Interaction	3	1441.232	.726	n. s.
Error (within)	547	1984.568		
Total	554			

The pre- and post-test means and changes are reported in Table 25. School means varied from 237.3 to 315.6. Changes by individual schools varied from a loss of 28.2 points to a gain of 43.1 points. Five experimental schools had gains and five had losses. Five control schools made gains and three had losses.

By type of preparation, the consultant-assisted schools had an initial 294.4 and a final 294.4 for no change. The schools without help reported a net change of 7.4. The schools with teachers taking the university field course had a change of -5.2.

TABLE 25

MEANS AND CHANGE BY SCHOOL ON PRE- AND POST-TESTS WITH THE TAQ IN 10 EXPERIMENTAL AND 8 CONTROL SCHOOLS

School Type and Preparation	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Change from Pre- to Post-Test
	N	$\bar{X}$	N	$\bar{X}$	
Experimental:					
38	8	290.5	6	283.0	- 7.5
39	10	282.4	10	254.2	-28.2
40	22	303.1	19	315.6	12.5
41	18	262.7	17	274.1	11.4
42	13	271.2	9	282.6	11.4
43	23	281.2	17	274.2	- 7.0
44	21	301.2	21	279.5	-21.7
46	13	257.5	9	300.6	43.1
47	17	238.3	16	268.1	- 0.2
48	21	289.5	18	291.9	2.4
Control Sch.:					
49	12	265.2	13	272.5	7.4
50	11	286.3	9	272.0	-14.3
51	11	284.3	15	292.6	8.3
52	26	309.3	27	315.4	6.1
53	15	238.8	13	237.3	- 1.5
54	13	266.1	12	264.2	- 1.9
55	27	276.4	18	285.8	9.4
56	14	272.9	11	288.7	15.9
Preparation:					
No Help	71	269.1	59	276.5	7.4
Consultant	32	294.4	29	294.4	0.0
Course 682	63	289.7	54	284.5	- 5.2
All Schools:					
Experimental	166	282.2	142	283.2	1.0
Control	129	277.7	118	283.6	5.9
Combined	295	280.3	260	283.4	3.1

DISCUSSION

Curriculum change occurs both in schools making a self-study and in those not so engaged, but in a given period of time, curriculum change occurs about 50 percent more often in schools making a self-study. The period of time about which the above generalization was made was approximately two years. Almost all changes are made either in the year of the self-study and visiting committee or in the following year. Current policy in the states of Florida and Georgia is to have a complete evaluation every ten years with some kind of mid-term project in five years. If the periods studied for Group I, II, and III schools and their controls is representative, then the average high school not engaged in a self-study is making about 10 curriculum changes a year--half the 19.8 mean for the control schools, covering a two-year period. At this rate, about 100 curriculum changes would be made during a 10-year interval if there were no *Evaluative Criteria*. With the *Evaluative Criteria*, the self-study, and the visiting committee, the number of changes per school during the 10-year period, would be 110. Not more than 3 of the extra 10 would be rated "major" changes. Only 2 would be course additions which would not have occurred without the self-study.

If a method could be used by which a faculty could be as continuously active in curriculum change as it is during the year before and after the visiting committee, then 150 curriculum changes would occur during the decade instead of 100 or 110.

How would method of preparation influence extrapolations on curriculum change? Schools without outside help in making their self-study would end up the decade with about 105 curriculum changes compared with the 100 they might have made without an evaluation. If they maintained the evaluation rate of change for the decade, they would have 125 changes compared with the 105 or 100. Schools with regular consultant help outside the system would make just about the average--110 for the decade, or 150 if they maintained a uniform rate of change year after year. Schools which had faculties registered for a university field laboratory course would make 116 for the 10 years, or 180 if they maintained their self-study pace.

There is, of course, a question of how long a school faculty could maintain the additional load. For many of the persons involved, many extra hours are required each week beyond teaching and other duties. There is also a question of diminishing returns on such activity. If the enrollment of a school is relatively constant new courses, new activities, and new services cannot be added indefinitely, especially when there is a tradition of seldom dropping a course, service, or activity once it is in the program.

Rejection of visiting committee recommendations ran higher than those reported in other studies. Review of related research indicated that about 70 percent of visiting committee recommendations were eventually accepted, and about 30 percent rejected. In the present study, about 50 percent of the recommendations for curriculum change were rejected. Some of the difference may be in recommendations in other studies for changes in addition to curriculum changes.

About two-thirds of the visiting committee recommendations were desirable changes recognized by the faculties before the arrival of the visitors. It is almost a customary practice for visiting committees to ask faculty committees what they need help with or what changes the faculty wants the visitors to support. This practice may lead to recommendations for which finances are not available, for which space and facilities are lacking, or for which personnel is either not available or not generated by ADA, or with which the administration disagrees. These reasons constitute more than 60 percent of the reasons for rejections.

The largest single source of rejections is because "the faculty disagrees." This seems almost contrary to reason when the faculty is so often the source of ideas for the visiting committee report. However, while it is a frequent source, it is not the only source. Again and again at work sessions of visiting committees a practice was observed in which visiting committees had copies of reports from other schools. Often sections of these were copied verbatim whether there was any real relevance to the situation in the school being evaluated. This may be a source of many faculty disagreements. The *Evaluative Criteria* states (33, p. 25) as a guiding principle that the evaluation by the visiting committee should be measured against the stated philosophy and objectives of the school. Practice observed was often contrary to this principle, and may, in part, account for the high rate of rejection due to faculty disagreement.

The average number of rejections is lowest among those schools preparing through university courses. It may be that they have been more thoughtful in examining possible changes during their self-study and hence make recommendations to themselves through the visiting committee which have some basis other than temporary enthusiasm. It may also be that they are more careful about the quality of the personnel on the visiting committee and hence are less likely to get "outrageous" recommendations. Several visiting committees were observed on which one or two members attempted to apply standards and impose judgments possibly appropriate for a first-rate liberal arts college but which were inappropriate for a comprehensive high school. However, these individuals appeared on committees in schools using the university course method of preparation. It may be that in such situations the other committee members had enough strength to temper these recommendations before they appeared in the final report.

Since English courses reach practically all high school students every year and since there are many elective courses besides the required English it should not be surprising that curriculum changes are reported almost a third oftener here than any other Evaluative Criteria area. It might be expected that with all the national curriculum efforts in mathematics and science that these fields would lead. While they are high, the number of changes reported bracket those in girls' and boys' physical education where there has been much publicity for physical fitness but no curriculum revision programs so well subsidized as those in mathematics and science.

Government efforts are probably reflected in the guidance changes reported and in the instructional-materials, audio-visual, library section. Both of these undoubtedly reflect government programs for training specialists in guidance and counselling and in the purchase of instructional equipment and materials. However, the student activity program which has had no such systematic attack holds a slight margin over both the guidance and materials changes reported. Possibly changes might be even more numerous in some areas if advanced training of personnel could always be correlated with new instructional equipment and materials. All too often the research staff found persons with advanced training in guidance who were spending much of their time at clerical tasks below their level of training. On the other hand, language laboratories, new hardware in libraries and media centers, and other new equipment such as closed circuit television were often idle or under-used because teachers and librarians were not properly prepared to take advantage of them.

A small number of changes were reported in health education and school health services. Both of these areas could profit from sweeping improvements in most schools observed in the opinion of the research staff. It is encouraging that there is a fairly consistent pattern of changes in health services, even though somewhat lower than desirable. As there appeared to be no common pattern for establishing responsibility for student activities and health services, in almost every school the research staff found that assignment for the purpose of self-study was the first time that any individual or group felt responsible for these areas, defined in this study as part of the curriculum. Thus, changes in these areas may be attributed clearly to the process of self-study and evaluation by the visiting committee.

Home economics is a field with regular supervisory services from several levels and one in which changes seem to occur whether schools are making self-studies or not. The pattern of change was fairly consistent during the four years investigated.

While teachers in general say they approve of selected elements of the evaluation, this approval does not approach unanimity. While about five-sixthsof the teachers approve the process as a whole, lesser fractions approved the visiting committee (about three-fourths) or the changes made in the curriculum (about two-thirds). Often teachers felt they were coerced into participation. Whether that coercion came from the principal, the central administration, or the accrediting association seemed to make only a little difference. Hence a few of them never became reconciled to the process and to the end felt that the money, time, and effort could have been better used in other ways.

The visiting committees sometimes left something to be desired. Teachers worked months, sometimes as much as a year prior to the arrival of the committee. While classroom observation is only a small part of the data-gathering process for the visiting committee, it looms large for many teachers. After all the preparation they felt frustrated not to be visited, or to feel that judgments were being made about them based upon one to three observations of a few minutes to perhaps half a period. Sometimes the committee visitation was far too short. Other sources of annoyance included having committee members working out-of-field, giving gratuitous advice when not appropriate, and making recommendations because of current fads. It might well be that consultants failed to be more popular because the role they assumed in working with faculties was not the role which particular faculties had expected them to assume.

It is also possible that some of the dissatisfaction about the evaluative process came about through approaching the school philosophy and statement of purposes and the study of the pupil population and community of the school as barriers to be surmounted before getting down to the important job of viewing the program of the school. This was all too often the position taken, not only by school faculties, but also on occasion by visiting committees who viewed these two as irrelevant ritual which had little bearing on the task at hand. Undoubtedly when these are viewed as the blueprint and foundation for an effective program, the self-study has a unity and coherence otherwise lacking.

Are changes which occur more often in experimental schools undergoing self-study and evaluation by the visiting committee commensurate with time, effort, and money invested? Qualitative evaluations of the changes reported were made by the member of the research staff conducting the interview. An effort was made to consider the philosophy and objectives of the particular school and the probabilities of sustained practice as judged from the resources and capabilities of the faculty. Less than one-third (28 percent) of the changes were deemed major, and considering the nature of these, the question is raised whether the return is worthy of the investment. Examples of major changes are as follows:

(1) added course in music appreciation to reach every pupil regardless of talent;

(2) modified course in social studies (content) by deleting industrial arts content and adjusting retained content to the objectives in social studies;

(3) modified guidance services (means) by adding a counselor, thereby increasing accessibility (increased utilization presumed);

(4) modified course (organization) in English by teachers scheduling individual conferences with every student on every out-of-class theme;

(5) subtracted a course in astronomy taught by a teacher in social studies whose hobby was astronomy but who had no preparation in the field.

Examples of minor changes which accounted for 72 percent of all changes attributable to the self-study and evaluation by the visiting committee are:

(1) added a service by establishing an achievement testing program in a rural school; the counselor was a part-time teacher of mathematics with no preparation in counseling and guidance;

(2) subtracted a course in secretarial science as not enough students requested it to justify the offering;

(3) modified a Latin course (content) to include cultural aspects (Latin was only foreign language taught in this rural school because they were unable to recruit a teacher prepared to teach a modern foreign language);

(4) modified a course in home economics (means) by adding reference books to library thus permitting out-of-class reading assignments;

(5) modified service (organization) by scheduling library to be open for six periods instead of three.

Teacher Opinions on Curriculum Change

Some replies to opinionnaires of the type of the TOCC used here would lead the investigator to think that some respondents are (1) playing games, (2) fail to read what they are responding to, or (3) manage to maintain barriers against what seems like simple, obvious, general information.

Item: How could 29 and 20 teachers, respectively, feel that neither the administrative staff of their school nor the faculty of their school had anything to do with curriculum change when they had just worked through the Evaluative Criteria? These people responded "not applicable."

Item: Almost five percent of the teachers replying to the TOCC felt that the Southern Association, which required the self-study as a condition for initial or continued accreditation, was "not applicable" as an influence on curriculum change.

Item: On a scale which went to 3.0 teachers responded 1.4 for the state legislatures as influencing curriculum change (excluding the 10 percent who felt this item was "not applicable") in two states in which legislatures have had a pattern of legislating on curriculum matters, including rather recently the required courses on Americanism versus Communism.

Item: National curriculum revision groups also were rated 1.4 on the 3.0 scale (and here, 292 or 17 percent said "not applicable") at a time when almost every high school has been influenced by the new mathematics, the new chemistry, the new physics, and the new biology, and some are beginning to feel national efforts in other areas.

Item: Civil rights activities of the U. S. government received a rating of only 1.1 of a possible 3.0 (and 234 persons, 13.6 percent said "not applicable") in two states going through sometimes painful integration procedures in which participation in federal assistance is often conditioned by steps toward integration, when many colleges and universities throughout the two states have had summer and year-long institutes to help those in the process make it succeed, and when the two states are the recipients of head-start programs, programs of economic opportunity and others, all having some influence on school curriculum in the area.

Item: Lay groups were at the bottom as influences for curriculum change, averaging only 0.8 on the 3.0 scale. If the thesis of many educational theorists that today's curriculum is a hodgepodge of unrelated subjects because of the pull in many different directions of organized outside groups is accurate, then this message has reached few persons within the profession.

Item: Noncredit faculty study projects were rated as "not applicable" by almost a third of the responding teachers, even though for a high proportion of the teachers involved, going through the self-study, which they voted as a worthwhile experience, could be considered a "help" to curriculum change.

On the positive side, of those who did think that some of these factors, resources, facilities, and activities were relevant, the equivalent of eight out of ten teachers felt that curriculum change was helped by faculty involvement in curriculum decisions, faculty work on committees, and National Science Foundation and National Defense Education Act institutes.

On the interviews, about 5 of 6 teachers felt that the self-study was worthwhile. On the TOCC about 10 percent of the teachers reported that teacher attitude toward evaluation worsened because of the evaluation experience. When one recalls that some teachers on the interview tended to take a neutral attitude toward the self-study, these figures tend to support each other and give a little evidence that the sample interviewed held views similar to the population which completed the TOCC.

While 7 of 10 teachers felt that both the visiting committee and the oral reports of the visiting committee "helped", the research staff often had reason to disagree. Study of individual school reports tended to confirm this disagreement. In one school where the oral report was a race between a late afternoon session and dismissal to beat the traffic jam 45 minutes later, and in another where the faculty did not get to hear the report, they still gave the oral reports 7 of 10 votes as helpful. The research staff was most impressed by well-organized reports which tended to cover the highlights of the various areas and which included material which gave psychological support to the school staffs and feasible, concrete suggestions for areas where further effort was possible and desirable. Reports of this type took from an hour and a half to two hours and a half. When well done, teachers formed an interested, eager audience and the observer felt a sense of teacher involvement and participation rather than boredom or antagonism.

About 63 percent of the teachers replied to the open-end question with a statement that the evaluation did make a difference in the quality of teaching in the school. However, most of the responses as to what changes resulted were only remotely related to quality of teaching. Responses like "helped to get to know total program and other teachers," "helped to get additional supplies and equipment," "helped to understand and use philosophy," "improved interpersonal relationships among staff," and "positive action was taken on the recommendations," which made up more than 50 percent of the responses, either do not relate to quality of teaching or are vague and ambiguous.

No support is given to the assertion by the results of the Teacher Activities Questionnaire, where a 1.0 mean gain was reported for all experimental schools as contrasted with a 5.9 gain for the control schools who showed more change without the evaluation, though neither change was statistically significant.

Test Results

The expectation of more openness to change as a concomitant of making the self-study was not realized, at least as measured by the CIM. It may be that the CIM is not an adequate instrument for assessing readiness for curriculum change. Its reliability is low and a study of patterns of responses by individuals before and after the self-study suggests that changes in individual scores are almost random over the period covered by the study.

The results of the THRQ are consistent with the pilot study by Alam the preceding year. Alam (1) found no significant difference between Florida experimental and control schools among those making the self-study in 1965-66, nor among experimental schools by the three types of preparation. However, he might have had a significant difference in favor of the four schools working with a university course plan of preparation except for a large drop by one school which occurred at the end of the year when the accrediting association declined to permit a visiting committee until certain systemwide conditions were met. The other three 1965-66 schools in this category made substantial gains. A similar pattern was followed by the faculties enrolled in university courses in 1966-67. The large urban school from the same system showed a substantial drop in mean score while the other three schools changed slightly and in a positive direction.

Alam's combined experimental and control schools in his 1965-66 pilot study lost about 4 points. The combined loss of both experimental and control schools in 1966-67 approached 9 points. The greater loss might have been the result of statewide disappointment at the action of a new governor in vetoing some of the modest increases for the public schools which were passed in the spring by the Florida legislature. However, the Georgia schools fared better from their legislature and governor and still dropped 5.8 points, a loss close to that reported by Alam for Florida in the preceding, nonlegislative year.

In the present study, the two schools classed as "consultant-assisted" had a relatively large loss on the THRQ. This large drop could be discounted because one of the two schools started as a "no help" school and was strongly urged to change to "consultant-assisted" preparation at midyear by the central administration. This school reported a very sharp drop on the THRQ. A similar control school from the same system lost 3.3 points compared with a drop of 25.5 for the experimental school.

The lack of change on the TAQ is cause for speculation. Since most of the experimental schools had consultant help and since they were to be observed, change in the direction of increased use of practices favored by expert opinion would be expected. Strangely, the "no help" schools reported a nonsignificant 7.4 point increase.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study sought to find (1) whether curriculum change occurred more often in high schools making self-evaluations based upon the Evaluative Criteria than in high schools not engaged in such a self-evaluation; (2) whether the method of preparation made a difference in the amount of curriculum change; (3) how teaching staffs felt about the evaluative process and other selected factors for influencing curriculum change; (4) whether teachers became more open or ready for curriculum change as they engaged in the self-evaluation; (5) whether participation in a self-study influenced teacher morale; and (6) whether teachers tended to use practices which experts thought were good more often as they went through a self-evaluation.

Conclusions

(1) During the year of self-study and the year following the visiting committee, curriculum change occurred more often than in comparable schools not going through a self-evaluation.

(2) For all experimental schools, the number of changes was about 50 percent greater than in the control schools.

(3) The type of preparation does influence the amount of curriculum change. Schools with faculty members enrolled in university field laboratory courses reported 77 percent more changes than their controls; those with consultant help from outside their school reported 52 percent more changes than their controls; those schools which made the self-study without outside help had 25 percent more changes than their controls.

(4) Curriculum changes are most likely to be course changes, to be faculty initiated, to have a positive influence on the attainment of the school objectives, and to be judged as minor changes by the research staff.

(5) Most changes are modifications of existing courses, services, or activities. Courses, services, and activities are seldom dropped.

(6) Even though many visiting committee recommendations were originally suggested to the visiting committee by the school staff, about half of the written recommendations of the visiting committee are rejected. Faculty and administrative disagreement with recommendations, lack of finance, lack of space and facilities, and unavailability of suitable personnel are the most frequent

reasons for rejecting recommendations.

(7) The number of curriculum changes reported was independent of the size of the school in Groups I, II, and III.

(8) English is the only subject area in which more changes occur than were reported in student activities, instructional materials and library services, and guidance.

(9) Teacher interview reactions to the self-study, the visiting committee, the curriculum changes made, and their consultants, were positive. These were approved, in descending order, by five-sixths, three-fourths, and two-thirds of those interviewed, respectively. Judgments on the consultants and the curriculum changes were influenced by the method of preparation with those teachers participating in university courses having the more favorable judgments.

(10) According to teacher judgments, the most influential factors in curriculum change are the administrative staff of the school, the administrative staff of the school system, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the faculty of the school, and the state department of education. Of least importance are consultants outside the system, professional organizations, civil rights activities of the government, and lay groups.

(11) A surprising number of teachers reported factors as "not applicable" to curriculum change which very obviously were applicable in the judgment of the majority of those responding.

(12) Strong support--eight of ten making judgments--went to faculty involvement in curriculum decisions, faculty curriculum committees, and National Science Foundation and NDEA institutes as factors helping curriculum change.

(13) Teachers felt that factors most affected by the self-study were increased library materials, increased audio-visual aids, and an increase in the number of teachers who were trying out new procedures.

(14) Teachers felt that the most important changes influencing them as outcomes of the self-study were a better understanding of the school philosophy and an enhanced appreciation of the work of other departments. Negatively, about 10 percent reported worsened attitudes toward the evaluative process and smaller percents reported worsened attitudes toward pupils and toward the community.

(15) The most helpful elements of the evaluative process according to teachers were the written recommendations of the visiting committees and the work of the D and E to H committees.

Some doubt was cast on these appraisals by almost equally high support for the oral reports of the visiting committees, even in cases where these were superficial, overly brief, and even unheard by most teachers.

(16) Almost two-thirds of the teachers thought that the evaluation made a difference in the quality of teaching in their schools, but when they were asked to spell out the difference, most examples were only slightly related to the quality of teaching.

(17) Participation in the self-study did not make teachers more open to curriculum change, nor did method of preparation relate to openness to curriculum change.

(18) The quality of teacher human relations declined over the year in both experimental and control schools. Changes were not significantly different by type of preparation.

(19) There was little change in the extent to which teachers used practices recommended by experts before and after the self-study. There were no significant differences in change between experimental and control schools or by type of preparation.

Implications and Recommendations

(1) If a school makes a self-study and has a visiting committee only once in ten years, the amount of curriculum change which occurs related to the evaluation process can well be relatively minor and relatively expensive.

(2) To maximize the curriculum change of the evaluative process, (a) the interval between complete self-studies should probably be not greater than five or six years; (b) schools should arrange for a field laboratory course in which they have access to university consultants; (c) it would be desirable to involve faculty and lay persons in the development of the school philosophy and the study of the school community prior to beginning the other subcommittee efforts; (d) great care should be made in the selection of visiting committees and the visiting committees should have adequate time for observation, interviewing, and meetings at the school; (e) one or more follow-up visits by members of the viciting committee would be desirable; (f) annual follow-up reports should be made on action taken on recommendations.

(3) School faculties need to develop greater understanding of the forces influencing curriculum change and how these forces impinge upon what the individual teachers are doing.

(4) Directors of field laboratory courses and consultants to school faculties should have agreement with faculties as to what the role expectations are for them and then should work in

these terms or else find substitutes who can work in desired ways.

(5) Visiting committee members should make judgments in terms of the stated purposes of the school and in terms of the characteristics of the pupil population and the type of community served.

(6) More attention should be given to dropping courses, services, and activities.

Recommendations for Further Study

(1) Are there qualitatively or quantitatively different curriculum changes in areas where there are vigorous nationwide projects? Examples would be science, mathematics, and guidance. Is the proportion of major changes greater? Do course additions and deletions occur more frequently? Are services and activities expanded?

(2) Why does teacher morale tend to go down over the course of a school year in most schools? It remains steady or goes up slightly in some schools. What is different about these schools? A possible clue might be further investigation of the impact of the field laboratory course on the school faculty. Five of eight schools with the field laboratory course in Alam's study and this one reported gains on the THRQ. Those which lost ground were in a system all of whose schools were banned from an official visiting committee by the accrediting association.

(3) How can consultants and directors of field laboratory courses work to improve the quality of teaching practices? Can this be done through requiring or encouraging individual or small group action research projects of participants?

(4) Are there other possible evaluation and accreditation procedures which might result in more consistent and systematic curriculum change?

(5) Have and have-not schools were observed within a single school system raising the question of whether the accreditation process being undertaken on a systemwide basis might be more productive by providing wider interaction among personnel and be more equitable in gains for all schools.

(6) Could a demographic study of need for teachers in all fields be utilized by educational institutions to aid in distribution according to need, particularly in non-urban areas?

(7) What are the sources of input of ideas for innovation in the schools? Can these be identified and enhanced?

SUMMARY

The Problem

This project sought to determine the scope and extent of curriculum change occurring in selected high schools as a result or concomitant of school self-evaluations conducted in accordance with regional accreditation policies, and of the impact of participation on selected attitudes and practices of the teachers involved.

Objectives

This project explored the hypothesis that high school self-evaluations, based on the Evaluative Criteria, produced curriculum change and had an impact on the attitudes and practices of teachers. Curriculum change was defined as any addition, subtraction, or modification of courses, activities, or services provided by a secondary school for its pupils. Specific objectives were:

(1) What changes in the curriculum of schools undergoing self-evaluation studies can be attributed to the studies?

(2) What changes are instituted during the self-study period before the arrival of the visiting committee, and what changes follow recommendations of the visiting committee?

(3) Are there differences as to apparent effectiveness in producing curriculum change which can be attributed to the preparation pattern, i.e., the school prepares largely on its own; outside consultants are used; university consultants are used under a plan which permits college course enrollment for school faculty members desiring it?

(4) Does participation in a school self-evaluation modify a faculty's readiness for curriculum change?

(5) Does participation in a school self-evaluation modify the quality of teacher human relations of the participants?

(6) Does participation in a school self-evaluation modify teachers' professional activities?

(7) How are the self-evaluations assessed by teacher participants, and how do they rate the influence on change of certain other possible sources of curriculum change?

Method

This project involved historical, interview, and instrument data collection in selected schools which had participated in self-evaluations or were going through the process using the *Evaluative Criteria* and visiting committees, with some use of control schools which had not been evaluated recently and were not immediately contemplating evaluation. For economy, schools were limited to Georgia and Florida.

Using tables of random numbers, a stratified sample of schools was selected. An attempt was made to get a balance among the three types of preparation and by year of evaluation. Twelve high schools were chosen from the school years of 1962-63, twelve from 1964-65, twelve from 1965-66, and twelve from 1966-67 which were involved in initial accreditation or re-evaluation during these years. Suitable control schools and pilot schools were selected at the same time. At the end of the project there were 46 usable experimental schools and 18 control schools.

Pilot studies were conducted in four schools to try out interview techniques and instruments. USOE clearance was obtained for interview guides, opinionnaires, and tests. The interviews followed a guide intended to get information on curriculum changes, sources of change, time of change, and other relevant information. The Teacher Opinionnaire on Curriculum Change included 77 forced-choice questions and one open-end question. Other instruments used were Duncan's Curriculum Improvement Measure (CIM), Walker's Teacher Human Relations Questionnaire (THRQ), and Mathews's Teacher Activities Questionnaire (TAQ).

Other sources of data were the marked copies of the *Evaluative Criteria* and the written reports of the faculty and the visiting committee.

Data were collected in schools evaluated in 1962-63 and in schools evaluated in 1964-65 during the first year of the project. The research staff visited 12 schools from each group, plus suitable control schools. Teachers from each of the *Evaluative Criteria* areas D through H were interviewed as well as such officials as principals, assistant principals, deans, and guidance directors when appropriate. All teachers still on the staff who had been through the self-study completed the TOCC. Similar interviews were conducted in control schools to find out if the same curriculum changes had been made.

During the second year of the project, similar visits were made to Group III schools, those having their evaluations in 1965-66 with similar interviewing and instrumentation, including interviewing at control schools.

Throughout the year 10 schools--initially 12--who were preparing for a visiting committee through making a self-study were visited periodically. The CIM, THRQ, and TAQ were administered at the beginning of the period and at the end. Narrative reports were made of the steps in the preparation process. All sessions of the visiting committee stage were covered. Follow-up visits were made with interviewing and post-instrumentation. Before and after testing was done with the control schools for the 1966-67 group. Interviewing was also done at the end of the year with these controls.

Results and Conclusions

(1) Curriculum change occurs from 25 to 75 percent more often during the year of the self-study and the year immediately following in schools making the self-study than in their controls. Schools working on their own make 25 percent more changes; schools with consultant help make about 50 percent more curriculum changes; schools with university courses, 75 percent.

(2) Curriculum changes are most likely to be course changes, to be faculty initiated, to have a positive influence on the attainment of the school objectives, and to be judged as minor changes by the research staff. Most changes are modifications of existing courses, services, or activities. Courses, services, and activities are rarely dropped.

(3) About 50 percent of the visiting committee recommendations are rejected or just not implemented because of faculty and administrative disagreement, cost, lack of space and facilities, and unavailability of suitable personnel.

(4) The number of curriculum changes reported was relatively independent of the size of the school.

(5) English is the only subject area in which more changes occur than were reported in the Evaluative Criteria areas of student activities, instructional materials and library services, and guidance.

(6) According to teacher judgments on the TOCC, the most influential factors in curriculum change are the administrative staff of one's own school, the administrative staff of the school system, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the faculty of the school, and the state department of education. Of least importance are consultants outside the system, professional organizations, civil rights activities of the government, and lay groups.

(7) Outstanding outcomes of the self-study and visiting committee recommendations, according to teachers, were increased

library materials, increased audio-visual aids, and an increase in the number of teachers trying innovations.

(8) Teachers felt that the most important changes influencing them were a better understanding of the school philosophy and an enhanced appreciation of the work of other departments. Negatively, about 10 percent reported worsened attitudes toward the evaluative process and smaller percents reported worsened attitudes toward pupils and toward the community.

(9) While teachers thought that the written recommendations of the visiting committee, the work of the D, D-1 to D-19, and E to H committees, and the oral reports of the visiting committees were very helpful and that the evaluation made a difference in the quality of teaching in their schools, there were reasons to doubt these assertions. School faculties where oral reports had been brief, superficial, or unheard judged them as valuable as schools with what the researchers felt were strong oral reports. When asked to tell how teaching was different, most of the reasons were only remotely related to teaching.

(10) On none of the three instruments were school faculties making the self-studies significantly different from their controls. Overall, in both experimental and control schools, the quality of human relations went down.

(11) There were no significant differences in the amount of change on any of the three instruments related to the type of preparation.

Implications and Recommendations

(1) If a school makes a self-study and has a visiting committee only once in ten years, the amount of curriculum change which occurs related to the evaluation process will be relatively minor and relatively expensive.

(2) To maximize the impact of school evaluations on curriculum change (a) the interval should probably be not greater than five or six years; (b) schools should arrange for a field laboratory course with access to university consultants; (c) faculty and community should be involved in developing the school philosophy and studying the school and community prior to the beginning of other subcommittee work; (d) great care should be made in the selection of visiting committees and the visiting committees should have adequate time--at least three days for most schools--for interviewing, observation, and meetings with teachers, students, and parents as well as meetings among themselves; (e) some follow-up visits by members of the visiting committee would be desirable; (f) annual follow-up reports should be made on action taken on recommendations of the visiting committee.

(3) School faculties need to develop greater understanding of the forces influencing curriculum change and how these forces impinge upon what the individual teachers are doing.

(4) Consultants and directors of field laboratory courses should have agreements with school faculties as to what role expectations are held for them and then should either work in these terms or find substitutes who can work in ways desired by faculties.

(5) Visiting committee members should make judgments in terms of the stated purposes of the school and in terms of the characteristics of the pupil population and the type of community served.

(6) More attention should be given to dropping courses, services, and activities.

Recommendations for Further Study

(1) Are there qualitatively or quantitatively different curriculum changes in areas where there are vigorous nationwide projects such as science, mathematics, and guidance?

(2) Why does teacher morale tend to go down over the course of a school year in most schools?

(3) How can consultants and directors of field laboratory courses work to improve the quality of teaching practices?

(4) Are there other possible evaluation and accreditation procedures which might result in more consistent and systematic curriculum change?

(5) Have and have-not schools were observed within a single school system raising the question of whether the accreditation process being undertaken on a systemwide basis might be more productive by providing wider interaction among personnel and be more equitable in gains for all schools.

(6) Could a demographic study of need for teachers in all fields be utilized by educational institutions to aid in distribution according to need, particularly in non-urban areas?

(7) What are the sources of input of ideas for curriculum innovation in the schools? Can these be identified and enhanced?

REFERENCES

1. Alam, Dale V. "The Relationship Between School Self-Evaluation Procedures and Changes in Teachers' Expressed Attitudes in Six Areas of Professional Human Relations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. 1966. 87 p.

2. Baden, Walter D. "The Focus of the High School, 1957-1962: An Analysis of Changes in Curriculum Balance in Four Selected Senior High Schools on Long Island, New York, since October, 1957." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1963. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV:3159-3160; No. 8, 1964.

3. Banning, Evelyn I. "Teacher Attitudes Toward Curriculum Change: The Effect of Personal Relationships on the Degree of Favorableness." Journal of Experimental Education. XXIII, December 1954. p. 133-147.

4. Batiste, John. "A Survey of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Business Education in Pennsylvania Public Secondary Schools Through an Analysis of Evaluative Criteria Reports." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1961. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII:882-883; No. 3, 1962.

5. Belt, Wilbur D. "A Survey of Actions Taken on Recommendations Resulting from the Cooperative Program for School Accreditation in the State of Wyoming." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1961. Abstract: The Colorado State College Abstracts, XXIII:30-33, 1961.

6. Brown, Alma. "Learning About Individualized Teaching," Educational Leadership. XVI, March 1959. p. 346-350.

7. Buford, Florence. "We Looked at Our Schools," The National Elementary Principal. XXXIV, December 1954. p. 20-22.

8. Callender, Lynn Ray. "Accreditation Recommendations and the Extent of Implementation in Selected Seventh-Day Adventist Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1966. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII: 893-894; No. 4A, 1966.

9. Cay, Donald F. "Selected Teachers' Expressed Judgments Concerning Barriers to Curriculum Improvement." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. 1960. 258 p.

10. Cope, Quill E. "An Appraisal of School Improvements Resulting from the Use of Evaluative Criteria in Selected High Schools in Tennessee." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1952. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XII:697-698; No. 5, 1952.

11. Deitrich, Francis Raymond. "Procedures and Results of Elementary School Evaluations Conducted in Twenty-Five Public School Systems in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Between 1955 and 1962." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1965. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI:4364-4365; No. 8, 1966.

12. Dempsey, Richard A. "An Analysis of Teachers' Expressed Judgments of Barriers to Curriculum Change in Relation to the Factor of Individual Readiness to Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.

13. Duncan, James K. "An Instrument for Measuring Readiness for Curriculum Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. 1954. 125 p.

14. Eckhardt, John W. "A Union High School District Appraises Itself," California Journal of Secondary Education. XXVIII, February 1953. p. 90-93.

15. Ely, Lawrence. "Teachers' Reactions to School Evaluation Using the Evaluative Criteria," National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin. XLIII, December 1959. p. 38-43.

16. England, Byron. "El Paso Surveys Its Schools," Educational Leadership. VIII, November 1950. p. 105-108.

17. Hahn, Bruce J. "A Follow-up Study of High School Evaluations in Oregon." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1955. Abstract: The Colorado State College Abstracts, XVII:47-51, 1955.

18. Hamill, Charles O. "A Proposed Plan to Evaluate the Public Secondary Schools of Puerto Rico." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1963. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV:4053; No. 10, 1964.

19. Hedge, L. W. "The Effect of Evaluation--Accreditation at Bakersfield," California Journal of Secondary Education. XXXIV, November 1959. p. 433-436.

20. Kiser, Robert Houston. "An Analysis of the Evaluations made by the Consultants of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction During the 1961-62 and 1962-63 School Years. (Research Study No. 1)." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI:7129; No. 12, 1966.

21. Lewin, Charles R., Jr. "In-Service Education in Relation to Curriculum Development: Trends and Recommended Programs in Secondary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV: 1013; No. 3, 1963.

22. Lewin, Kurt. "Forces Behind Food Habits and Methods of Change." The Problem of Changing Food Habits. Bulletin of the National Research Council, No. 108. October 1943.

23. Lewin, Kurt; Lippitt,Ronald; and White, Ralph K. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates,'" Journal of Social Psychology. X, May 1939. p. 271-299.

24. Littrell, J. Harvey. "When Teachers Evaluate Curriculum Study," Educational Leadership. XXII, December 1964. p. 173-176.

25. Manlove, Donald C.; and McGlasson, Maurice. "Reactions of Faculty and Visiting Committee Members to Evaluation Instruments and Procedures in Selected Indiana Junior High Schools," National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin. XLIX, April 1965. p. 64-76.

26. Martin, Clyde M. "The Adequacy of Selected Procedure Developed for Administering the Evaluative Criteria Study in Oregon." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State College, 1959. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XIX:3174; No. 12, 1959.

27. Mathews, Roderic D. "Reactions of Administrators after Evaluation with Materials Developed by the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards," National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin. XLII, May 1958. p. 7-27.

28. Mathews, Walter B. "Techniques for Studying Certain Professional Activities of Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida, 1954.

29. Mertz, Robert Lowell. "The Relationship of Selected Variables to the Adoption and Implementation of Recommendations of Educational Surveys of Public School Corporations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1965. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII:357-358; No. 2A, 1966.

30. McClendon, Paul Ed. "An Investigation of Change in Perception of Teachers as Affected by Faculty Self Study Activities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1963. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV: 4548; No. 11, 1964.

31. McQuigg, Robert B. "Participation in Curriculum Committees by Classroom Teachers in Selected Colorado School Systems." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1962. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII:3733; No. 10, 1963.

32. Miles, Mathew B. (editor). Innovation in Education. New York; Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1964. 689 p.

33. National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. Evaluative Criteria. Washington, D. C.: National Study of Secondary School Evaluation. 1960.

34. Newman, Carl A. "An Analysis of Educational Program Recommendations Resulting from Evaluations of Selected High Schools of Allegheny County." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1955. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XV, 1769-1770; No. 10, 1955.

35. Pace, Vernon D. "A Follow-up Study of the Pilot Program of Evaluation in Selected Junior High Schools in Indiana." Unpublished doctoral dissertation abstract, Indiana University. April 1967. 12 p.

36. Pellegrin, Lionel O. "An Evaluation of the Procedure Required for Accreditation of Elementary Schools by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1962. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII:2398-2399; No. 7, 1963.

37. Peterson, Lilian L. "Montana's Self-Evaluation Program Uses Communication for Effective Results," Montana Education, XXIX, April 1953. p. 9-11.

38. Ricart, John E. "A Survey of Actions Taken on Recommendations Resulting from the Evaluations of the Pittsburgh Public Secondary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1956. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XVI:1095-1096; No. 6, 1956.

39. Rubie, Harry C. "Improvement in Instruction as a Result of Accreditation at Sweetwarter," California Journal of Education. XXXIV, November 1959. p. 447-449.

40. Rucker, W. Ray. *Curriculum Development in the Elementary Schools*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. Chapter 18.

41. Siegler, Alfred C., and Allen, Charles R. "Accreditation-Evaluation as a Means of Improving Instruction," *California Journal of Secondary Education*. XXXIV, November 1959. p. 439-446.

42. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. *Proceedings of the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. December 1951.

43. Teckman, Charles E. "The Influence of State Departments and Regional Accrediting Associations on Secondary School Experimentation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1962. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV:168; No. 1, 1963.

44. Thompson, Yewell R. "Techniques for Studying Program Development within a School." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. 1954. 489 p.

45. Verduin, John R. "An Evaluation of a Cooperative Approach to Curriculum Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII: 4581; No. 12, 1963.

46. Walker, Ralph H. "A Technique for Assessing Teacher Human Relations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. 1954. 136 p.

47. Wear, Pat W. "The Secondary School in Kentucky as Revealed by the Use of the *Evaluative Criteria*." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1956.

48. Webster, Charles W. "How Accreditation Helped to Improve Education at Palm Springs High School," *California Journal of Secondary Education*. XXXIV, November 1959. p. 437-438.

APPENDIX A
LISTS OF SCHOOLS

LIST OF THE TWELVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GROUP I UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN 1962-63

Secondary School	City	State
Bellview Junior High School	Pensacola	Florida
Bradwell Institute	Hinesville	Georgia
Deland Senior High School	Deland	Florida
Graceville High School	Graceville	Florida
Hamilton High School	Scotsdale	Georgia
McEachern High School	Powder Springs	Georgia
Metter High School	Metter	Georgia
Miami Military Academy	Miami	Florida
Plant High School	Tampa	Florida
Seacrest High School	Delray Beach	Florida
Southeast High School	Samoset	Florida
Terrill County High School	Dawson	Georgia

LIST OF THE TWELVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GROUP II UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN 1964-65

Secondary School	City	State
Charlotte Junior High School	Punta Gorda	Florida
Harper Senior High School	Atlanta	Georgia
Hutto High School	Bainbridge	Georgia
LaSalle High School	Miami	Florida
Mainland Junior High School	Daytona Beach	Florida
Martin County High School	Stuart	Florida
Morgan County High School	Madison	Georgia
Northeast High School	Fort Lauderdale	Florida
Pickens County High School	Jasper	Georgia
Seabreeze Senior High School	Daytona Beach	Florida
Villa Rica High School	Villa Rica	Georgia
Zephyrhills High School	Zephyrhills	Florida

LIST OF THE TWELVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GROUP III UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN 1965-66

Secondary Schools	City	State
Arnold Junior High School	Columbus	Georgia
Bainbridge High School	Bainbridge	Georgia
Cartersville Junior High School	Cartersville	Georgia
Groves High School	Savannah	Georgia
Miami Carol City High School	Miami	Florida
Miami Coral Park High School	Miami	Florida
New Smyrna Beach High School	New Smyrna Beach	Florida
Perry Junior High School	Perry	Georgia
Sebring High School	Sebring	Florida
South Fulton High School	East Point	Georgia
Wedgewood High School	Pensacola	Florida
Westwood Junior High School	Gainesville	Florida

LIST OF THE TEN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GROUP IV UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE IN 1966-67

Secondary Schools	City	State
Baldwin High School	Baldwin	Florida
Blanche Ely High School	Pompano Beach	Florida
Dallas High School	Dallas	Georgia
Fulton High School	Atlanta	Georgia
Hoover Junior High School	Indialantic Beach	Florida
Leesburg High School	Leesburg	Florida
Leto High School	Tampa	Florida
Sequoyah High School	Doraville	Georgia
Walker High School	Atlanta	Georgia
Wolfson High School	Jacksonville	Florida

LIST OF TWENTY SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GROUP V NOT UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THE PERIOD OF SELF-STUDY IN THE EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOL FOR WHICH IT WAS A CONTROL

Secondary School	City	State
Group I Controls		
Blount Junior High School	Pensacola	Florida
Chamberlain High School	Tampa	Florida
Forest Hill High School	West Palm Beach	Florida
Group II Controls		
Archer High School	Atlanta	Georgia
Central High School	Carrollton	Georgia
Columbus High School	Miami	Florida
Group III Controls		
Fort King Junior High School	Ocala	Florida
Miami Norland Senior High School	Miami	Florida
Piedmont Junior High School	Rockmart	Georgia
Thomas High School	College Park	Georgia
Thomasville High School	Thomasville	Georgia
Waycross Junior High School	Waycross	Georgia
Group IV Controls		
Baker County High School	Macclenny	Florida
Clermont High School	Clermont	Florida
Cross Keys High School	Atlanta	Georgia
Dillard Comprehensive High School	Fort Lauderdale	Florida
Osborne Senior High School	Marietta	Georgia
Robinson High School	Tampa	Florida
Southwest Junior High School	Melbourne	Florida
Walter George High School	Atlanta	Georgia

LIST OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS USED FOR PILOT STUDY OF METHODS AND TECHNIQUES PROPOSED FOR STUDY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE

Secondary School	City	State
Cocoa Beach High School	Cocoa Beach	Florida
St. Augustine High School	St. Augustine	Florida
Turkey Creek High School	Plant City	Florida
Fletcher High School	Jacksonville Beach	Florida

APPENDIX B

University of Florida

INTERVIEW GUIDE

School:____________

Address:____________

Int. #:____________

I. Position:___ Sex__ No. Yrs. Exp. in Sec.Sch.__;in this Sch.__

II. Preparation: No help__;Consultants in this school system__; Consultants outside this system__; Consultants with College Credit Courses___.

III. Committee responsibilities: Ch. = Chairman; M = Member.

__D Program of Studies
__D-1 Agriculture
__D-2 Art
__D-3 Business Education
__D-4 Core Program
__D-5 Distributive Education
__D-6 Driver Education
__D-7 English
__D-8 Foreign Language
__D-9 Health Education
__D-10 Home Economics
__D-11 Industrial Arts
__D-12 Mathematics
__D-13 Music
__D-14 Phys. Ed. for Boys
__D-15 Phys. Ed. for Girls
__D-16 Religion
__D-17 Science
__D-18 Social Studies
__D-19 Voc. Trade & Indust. Educ.

__ E Student Activity Program
__ F Instr. Mat. Serv. - Library & A-V
__ G Guidance Services
__ H Health Services
__ J School Staff & Administration

REACTION

Self-Study	Consultants	Visiting Com.	Changes in Curriculum

University of Florida

INTERVIEW GUIDE
page 2

School:_______________
Address:______________
Int. #:_______________

CHANGE			
ORIG. OF RECOM.			
WHEN MADE			
WHY			
WHERE	This school only__ System-wide______	This school only__ System-wide______	This school only__ System-wide______

Recommendations Not Followed	Reason

APPENDIX C-1

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Name of School________
City & State__________
Date__________________

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE ON CURRICULUM CHANGE

The questions below are designed to elicit your opinions about the way the curriculum changes in your school. Please answer all of the questions in terms of the whole school as you see it.

I. Please rate the influence of the following in changing the curriculum of your school. Use the 0-3 scale, with 0 meaning no influence and 3 meaning very influential. NA means this item does not apply to your school. Circle your response. Please rate all items.

	not applicable	no influence			very influential
1. Administrative staff of the system	NA	0	1	2	3
2. Administrative staff of your school	NA	0	1	2	3
3. Guidance staff	NA	0	1	2	3
4. Supervisors and resource personnel	NA	0	1	2	3
5. Consultants from outside the system	NA	0	1	2	3
6. Lay groups	NA	0	1	2	3
7. Faculty	NA	0	1	2	3
8. State department of education	NA	0	1	2	3
9. Nat'l. curriculum revision groups (SMSG, BSCS)	NA	0	1	2	3
10. Testing programs	NA	0	1	2	3
11. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	NA	0	1	2	3

	not applicable	no influence			very influential
12. State legislature	NA	0	1	2	3
13. Professional organizations	NA	0	1	2	3
14. Federal support	NA	0	1	2	3
15. Civil rights activities of U. S. Government	NA	0	1	2	3

II. In your opinion what has helped or hindered curriculum change in your school? Please circle the appropriate response on the scale below each item.

1. Faculty involvement in curriculum decisions

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

2. Working with other teachers

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

3. Visiting other schools

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

4. Faculty meetings with the principal

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

5. Faculty committees

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

6. Workshops

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

7. Non-credit faculty study projects

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

8. Faculty planning and in-service training day

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

9. University or college courses

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

10. National Science Foundation or NDEA institutes

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

11. Community survey by school

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

12. School survey by outside agency

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

13. Parent-faculty committees

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

14. System-wide curriculum planning

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

15. Pre-school planning conferences

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

16. Review of research published by others

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

17. Action research done in your school

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

18. Adequacy of physical facilities

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

19. Availability of qualified teaching personnel

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no change	helped	not applicable

III. In your opinion what changes resulted from the self-study? Please circle the appropriate response on the scale below each item.

A. The Program of the School

1. Relation of the program of the school to the stated philosophy of the school

a	b	c	NA
less consistent	no change	more consistent	not applicable

2. The number of elective courses offered

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

3. Freedom of choice in what the student takes

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

4. Amount of cooperative planning among faculty

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

5. Number of teachers trying out new procedures in the classroom

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

6. Number of guidance services available

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

7. Number of extracurricular activities available

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

8. Participation in extracurricular activities

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

9. Uniformity of grading standard

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

10. Number of library materials available

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

11. Student use of library

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

12. Quantity of audio-visual aids available

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

13. Quality of audio-visual aids available

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

14. Number of health services available

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

15. Number of courses required for graduation

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

16. Number of students in each class

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

17. Amount of time provided for teacher planning

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

B. Professional Staff

1. Teachers' relationship to principal

a	b	c	NA
less cooperative	no change	more cooperative	not applicable

2. Teachers' attitude toward total school

a	b	c	NA
worsened	no change	improved	not applicable

3. Teachers' attitude toward community

a	b	c	NA
worsened	no change	improved	not applicable

4. Teachers' attitude toward pupils

a	b	c	NA
worsened	no change	improved	not applicable

5. Teachers' attitude toward evaluation

a	b	c	NA
worsened	no change	improved	not applicable

6. Teachers' attitude toward teaching

a	b	c	NA
worsened	no change	improved	not applicable

7. Teachers' attitude toward other teachers

a	b	c	NA
worsened	no change	improved	not applicable

8. Teachers' understanding of school philosophy

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

9. Teachers' agreement with school philosophy

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

10. Teaching on the basis of the school philosophy

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

11. Teachers' membership in professional organizations

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

12. Teachers' active participation in professional organizations

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

13. Teachers' appreciation of contribution of other departments to achieving purposes of school

a	b	c	NA
decreased	no change	increased	not applicable

IV. In your opinion what elements of the evaluation helped or hindered curriculum change?

1. Developing the philosophy of the school

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

2. Studying the pupil population of the school

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

3. Surveying the community

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

4. Serving on "D" committees (program of studies)

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

5. Serving on "E"-"H" committees (guidance, instructional materials, health service, student activities)

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

6. Serving on "I"-"J" committees (school plant, school staff and administration)

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

7. The visits by the visiting committee

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

8. The oral report of the visiting committee

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

9. The written recommendations of the visiting committee

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

10. Post-visitation faculty meetings

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

11. Post-visitation committee meetings

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

12. The follow-up study of the graduates of your school

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

13. The study of the causes of drop-outs from your school

a	b	c	NA
hindered	no influence	helped	not applicable

V. In your opinion, did the evaluation of your school make any differences in the quality of teaching in your school? If so, please describe them briefly.

APPENDIX C-2

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
Gainesville, Florida

Name of School ________
City & State ________
Date ________

TEACHER HUMAN RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

The following statements are designed to allow you to indicate how you feel about your job and your school. Read each statement and indicate your agreement and disagreement with the statement by writing the appropriate number from the answer scale in the blank provided at the left. It is important that you try to answer each question in terms of how you feel about the statement.

Answer Scale

(1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3) Agree

___ 1. I believe we should give more attention to teaching the three "R's."

___ 2. I do not believe in a lot of "frills" in the classroom.

___ 3. Some children in my classes should never have been passed from the previous grade.

___ 4. Much of the material I have to cover is so dull that my children are bored with it.

___ 5. The teaching profession does not allow me to make full use of my abilities.

___ 6. Teaching requires that I compromise some of my real values.

___ 7. Teachers are essentially selfish.

___ 8. Teachers here are wonderful to work with.

___ 9. Teachers here are too set in their ways.

___ 10. There is at least one teacher here whose personal habits I simply cannot tolerate.

___ 11. I find it easy to accept everyone on this faculty.

___ 12. Some teachers here think they have all the answers.

(1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3) Agree

___13. Teachers here willingly accept their share of the responsibilities of the school.

___14. Most of our teachers have a real understanding of how to work with children.

___15. There are people on this faculty who are a discredit to the teaching profession.

___16. I feel as though I "belong" socially and professionally with this faculty.

___17. At faculty meetings I feel free to express my opinions because I know that the other teachers will give me a fair hearing even when they disagree with me.

___18. Certain faculty members seem to have more influence with the principal than I do.

___19. Some teachers are kept on the faculty only because they have influence with powerful people in the community.

___20. Teachers here form in groups of personal friends in the lunchroom, at faculty meetings and the like.

___21. This faculty gives a teacher the sense of belonging and being needed.

___22. Teachers are jealous of new teachers who join the staff.

___23. Teachers on this faculty work well together.

___24. Whenever this faculty attacks a problem as a team they get the job done.

___25. The principal never acts impulsively or emotionally.

___26. The principal deliberately dodges issues.

___27. When teachers oppose policies formulated by the principal they do not hesitate to tell him so.

___28. The principal has the school well organized and it runs smoothly.

___29. I feel that the principal tries to escape or shift to others responsibilities that are rightfully his.

(1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3) Agree

___30. The principal leads the faculty into developments which they do not favor when he thinks these will help the school made a good impression.

___31. It is difficult to know just what to expect because the principal is always making changes.

___32. Certain people on this faculty have more influence over school affairs than the principal does.

___33. The principal never calls a teacher down in front of others.

___34. During faculty meetings the principal discusses mistakes that individual teachers have made without naming the offending teachers.

___35. Teachers feel that they will be penalized in some way if they displease the principal.

___36. In faculty meetings the principal is skilled at giving the appearance of agreement when actually there is no agreement.

___37. The principal does not usually praise teachers for good work done.

___38. Most of the small irritations that disturb teachers in this school are caused by the principal.

___39. The principal has favorties among the staff who get special treatment from him.

___40. The principal will listen to my ideas.

___41. I think our principal is a wonderful person.

___42. The principal is genuinely interested in me and in what I am doing.

___43. There are students in my classes who cannot be taught anything because they are not capable of learning.

___44. Students here do not want to study, they only want to have a good time.

___45. I have too many children who do not want to learn.

___46. Too few of my students are really working up to their ability.

(1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3) Agree

___47. My students are very cooperative.

___48. Students in this school are very selfish.

___49. Our students display plenty of school spirit.

___50. Students here are really working together to make this a better school.

___51. Students are willing and capable of accepting responsibiity.

___52. Students here are careless with library books and frequently lose them.

___53. I find that my students can be depended upon to do the jobs they have agreed to do.

___54. Students here tend to think that the school belongs to them and that we of the faculty just work here.

___55. Students in our school are well trained and it shows up in the orderly, quiet way they conduct themselves in rooms, halls, and on the playground.

___56. If I were free to choose pupils, I would select all the same students I now have.

___57. Too many of our students do not act their age.

___58. Upperclass students tend to corrupt the younger students by undermining their standards of conduct.

___59. Teachers enjoy working in this school.

___60. Conditions in this school are static; we do not seem to be making any progress.

___61. There is an undercurrent of discontent among faculty members in this school.

___62. If I were free to choose, I would remain at this school in my present position.

___63. This school is not as good as people think.

___64. I would make many changes in this school if I were principal.

___65. People outside this school do not know what it is really like.

(1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3) Agree

___66. Certain departments get first consideration for funds and materials.

___67. We do not have sufficient faculty meetings to allow discussion of all the things that need to be discussed.

___68. Too much time is spent discussing petty matters at faculty meetings.

___69. This school is organized so that teachers always know what is expected of them.

___70. Some teachers here bring pressure on the others to keep things going their way.

___71. This school fosters a strong feeling of belonging in its teachers.

___72. A strong point about our school is in the fact that children are given opportunity to develop leadership ability.

___73. It is difficult to plan and work with my classes because extra-curricular activities take up so much of the children's time.

___74. In general I am satisfied with the equipment and materials provided for my department.

___75. People who live in this community are vitally interested in the school and what it is trying to do.

___76. There are courses we should teach in this school, but the community will not approve.

___77. The community fully appreciates the work the school is doing.

___78. Some people in this community have too much influence in school affairs.

___79. The morals in this community are not as high as they should be.

___80. Parents in this community are too strict on their children.

___81. Parents in this community are vitally interested in their children.

___82. Too many people in this community snoop into other people's affairs.

(1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3) Agree

___83. This is the best community I have ever worked in.

___84. There are certain reasons why I do not feel accepted in this community.

___85. This community puts the same standards on the personal life of the teacher as on any other citizen.

___86. Unmarried teachers do not feel free to date in this community.

___87. Teachers are looked on with respect in this community.

___88. Many social organizations, clubs and the like are not open to teachers in this community.

___89. What teachers say and think is heard with respect in this community.

___90. The community provides many social opportunities for teachers.

APPENDIX C-3

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
Gainesville, Florida

Name of School ________
City & State __________
Date__________________

TEACHER ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

Qualify each statement as it refers to the frequency with which this particular teacher activity occurs in your professional life by writing the appropriate number from the answer key in the blank provided at the left. This instrument is not intended as a rating scale of teaching competencies, but is a method of collecting certain data for analysis of specific teacher activities.

Answer Key

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___ 1. I join national educational associations that are devoted to general educational problems.

___ 2. I join state educational associations that are devoted to general educational problems.

___ 3. I join local or county educational associations that are devoted to general educational problems.

___ 4. I participate actively in local or county educational associations that are devoted to general educational problems.

___ 5. I join national educational associations that are devoted to my special teaching field.

___ 6. I join state educational associations that are devoted to my special teaching field.

___ 7. I join local or county educational associations that are devoted to my special teaching field.

___ 8. I participate actively in state educational associations that are devoted to my special teaching field. (Participation through committee work, holding office, writings of professional nature.)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___ 9. I participate actively in local or county educational associations that are devoted to my special teaching field. (Participation through committee work, holding office, writings of professional nature.)

___10. I study carefully journals and yearbooks published by professional organizations that are devoted to general educational problems.

___11. I study carefully journals and yearbooks that are published by professional organizations that are devoted to my special teaching field.

___12. I use contacts with professional organizations that are devoted to general educational problems to become acquainted with leaders in the teaching profession.

___13. I use contacts with professional organizations that are devoted to my special teaching field to become acquainted with leaders in my special teaching field.

___14. I use resources that I gain through my contacts with professional organizations that are devoted to problems of general education to improve the learning situation for my pupils.

___15. I improve the learning situation for my pupils by using resources that I gain through my contacts with professional organizations that are devoted to my special teaching field.

___16. I use professional leave to attend the meetings of professional organizations.

___17. I secure supplementary teaching materials from state supervisory personnel.

___18. I secure supplementary teaching materials from county supervisory personnel.

___19. I confer with county supervisory personnel about my personal problems.

___20. I receive direction from my principal about professional readings that are applicable to my special teaching field.

___21. I invite my principal to observe my teaching procedures.

___22. I schedule conferences with my principal for the purpose of appraising my teaching procedures.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___23. I confer with my principal when a pupil is failing continually to make satisfactory progress.

___24. I confer with my principal when problems of undisciplined pupil behavior occur in my classes,

___25. I schedule a parent-teacher-principal conference when a parent expresses dissatisfaction with my teaching program.

___26. I confer with my principal about my personal problems.

___27. I express to my principal my views on the need for the revision of school policy.

___28. I confer with my principal when I do not understand existing school policy.

___29. I work with the principal and other teachers to define school policy.

___30. I work with the principal and other teachers to appraise the total school program.

___31. I channel my need for supervisory assistance on instructional problems through school personnel other than the principal.

___32. I channel my need for supervisory assistance on disciplinary problems through school personnel other than the principal.

___33. I work with other teachers in defining school policy.

___34. I work with other teachers on program improvement.

___35. I serve on faculty committees that are organized to plan and coordinate such activities as Christmas programs or open house.

___36. I work with other teachers in evaluating the total school program.

___37. I work with other teachers in child study groups.

___38. I use other teachers as resource persons in my work with my pupils

___39. I serve as a resource person for other teachers.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___40. I make new teachers feel that they belong to the faculty group.

___41. I become acquainted with the point of view of other teachers in pre-planning and post-planning sessions.

___42. I participate in activities that increase the group feeling of the total staff.

___43. I work with other teachers to coordinate extra-curricular activities such as stamp clubs or journalism work.

___44. I arrange with other teachers for my pupils and theirs to share joint field trips.

___45. I confer with parents about the type of pupil growth that will be promoted in my teaching.

___46. I write letters to parents to promote parental understanding of my instructional procedures.

___47. I write letters to parents to communicate with them about problems of pupil adjustments.

___48. I encourage parents to visit my classroom to observe teaching procedures.

___49. I use parents in my teaching as resource persons.

___50. I hold parent-teacher conferences at school.

___51. I hold parent-teacher conferences in the homes of the parents.

___52. I schedule parent-pupil-teacher conferences.

___53. I attend parent-teacher study groups.

___54. I attend meetings of the Parent-Teacher Association.

___55. I use parents to organize and coordinate social activities for my pupils.

___56. I utilize chance meetings with parents to communicate with them about pupil progress.

___57. I use the telephone to discuss pupil progress with parents.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___58. I make differential assignments based on the special needs and interests of my pupils.

___59. I plan prior to the opening of school or in pre-planning sessions a flexible schedule of the work that will be presented during the term.

___60. I organize my classes in such a way that individuals and groups with different abilities can move ahead more rapiidly or go more slowly than others.

___61. I establish a learning atmosphere in my classes that fosters a feeling of self-respect in all pupils.

___62. I drill for skills by providing materials that have meaning and purpose for the pupils.

___63. I provide opportunities for pupils to become acquainted with the regulations of the school.

___64. I provide opportunities for pupils to master the essential skills for academic progress.

___65. I work with pupils in defining our goals.

___66. The pupils and I plan together for the learning experiences that will be provided in my classes.

___67. I provide opportunities for pupils to organize groups in which project work is decided upon by the members of the group.

___68. I assist groups and individuals to formulate ways of appraising their progress.

___69. I provide opportunities for each pupil to appraise his own progress.

___70. I provide opportunities for groups to apprsise their progress.

___71. I provide opportunities for pupils to develop skill in choice making.

___72. I use counsel instead of punishment in dealing with undisciplined pupil behavior.

___73. I use a code of behavior developed by teacher-pupil planning to govern the conduct of the class.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___74. I provide attractive physical surroundings for my classes.

___75. I encourage pupils to experiment with new ideas.

___76. I provide a wide variety of learning materials.

___77. I help pupils to determine their present values.

___78. I help pupils to understand and accept their own limitations.

___79. I provide opportunities for pupils to work independently on projects of their own choice.

___80. I file samples of pupils' work as evidence of pupil progress.

___81. I assume responsibility for maintaining order in my classroom.

___82. I provide opportunities for pupils to explore the community.

___83. I provide opportunities for pupils' work to be attractively displayed.

___84. I provide opportunities for my pupils to participate regularly in physical education activities when in good health.

___85. I supervise physical education activities.

___86. I utilize existing community health services in my work with pupils.

___87. I encourage pupils to improve and maintain their own health.

___88. I encourage pupils to assume responsibility for protecting the health of others.

___89. I organize my teaching procedures to achieve a satisfactory balance of rest and activity.

___90. I follow-up findings of health examinations of pupils to get defects corrected.

___91. I provide environmental sanitation for my pupils that guarantees adequate ventilation, heating and lighting, appropriate seating, and safety supervision.

___92. I select learning materials that are adapted to the age, development and interests of the pupil for whom they are intended.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

___93. I select learning materials that reflect present-day knowledge with scientific accuracy.

___94. I use films to implement my teaching procedures.

___95. I provide learning experiences that stimulate in the pupils a desire to investigate the world of nature.

___96. I help pupils find a means of self-expression in music.

___97. I help pupils find a means of self-expression in art.

___98. I help the pupils to gain an increased appreciation of their cultural heritage through an exploration of literature.

___99. I use professional readings to secure suggestions for improving my teaching procedures.

___100. I study research findings in human growth and development to increase my understanding of pupil needs and pupil behavior.

___101. I use suggestions from other teachers to improve my teaching procedures.

___102. I act upon suggestions made by my supervisors to improve my teaching procedures.

___103. I use pre-planning and post-planning sessions to appraise my teaching procedures.

___104. I experiment with new teaching procedures.

___105. I revise my files of illustrative and supplementary teaching materials.

___106. I seek counsel about educational problems from educational specialists outside my particular school staff.

___107. I participate in faculty study groups.

___108. I study the patterns of community life of the community in which I teach.

___109. I attend classes for college credit during the regular school year.

___110. I attend summer school.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Seldom or Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Always or Almost Always

__111. I participate as a directing teacher in an internship program.

__112. I use contacts with professional organizations to strengthen and develop my professional attitudes.

__113. I examine social ideals in the light of economic, political, and social changes.

APPENDIX C-4

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
Gainesville, Florida

Name of School __________
City & State __________
Date __________

CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT MEASURE

The following statements about society, education, and your school present a variety of points of view and attitudes. Answers cannot be said to be right or wrong because the situation and your point of view determine the answer. Please express your point of view with regard to each statement.

If you agree with the whole statement more than you disagree with it mark it A in the space provided at the left of the statement. If you disagree more than you agree with it mark it D in the space provided at the left of the statement. If you are uncertain about the whole statement mark it U in the space provided at the left of the statement.

A	U	D
Agree more than disagree	Uncertain	Disagree more than agree

___ 1. The intelligence of the people should be relied upon for governing themselves.

___ 2. The best form of democratic decision making is by majority vote.

___ 3. It is characteristic of educational problems that if you try to solve one you find two more and end up by doing little about any of them.

___ 4. In a curriculum improvement program a specialist should devote a good deal of time to demonstration teaching.

___ 5. Every evidence of Communism in American public office should be ruthlessly tracked down.

___ 6. Individuals lose their effectiveness when they work in groups having 10 or 12 members.

___ 7. Our teachers should be given intelligently worked out solutions to their curriculum problems.

___ 8. Teachers should try intelligently to improve a bad classroom situation before they find out who is to blame.

A	U	D
Agree more than disagree	Uncertain	Disagree more than agree

___ 9. Our school committees are most effective when a strong leader controls the committee.

___10. The activities of such different groups as schools, business, and government are quite interdependent.

___11. Society operates pretty much on a "dog-eat-dog" basis.

___12. A difficulty with group work is that the able people get outvoted by the average.

___13. The main reason that instruction should be individualized is because pupils differ in intelligence.

___14. As far as our school is concerned there is wisdom in the adage "let well enough alone."

___15. In a curriculum improvement program regular lectures on curriculum and curriculum theory should be given by a consultant.

___16. Discipline problems are best handled by locating the culprit and properly punishing him.

___17. To be a good group leader in our school a person must be able to control the people in the group.

___18. The United Nations should have whole-hearted American support.

___19. It is essential in a curriculum improvement program that the teachers thoroughly study a good text on curriculum.

___20. As long as I am a member of a group I am responsible to abide by the decisions the group makes.

___21. The goal of curriculum improvement efforts is the revision of old courses or the introduction of new courses.

___22. Private enterprise is the most essential feature of the American way of life.

___23. School problems are usually caused by faulty administration.

___24. As a member of a small group I feel a responsibility to participate whether I am interested in the matter or not.

APPENDIX D
University of Florida

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

Name of School:________________ Control School:________________
City & State:________________
Group:______ Preparation______ Research Assistant:________________
Form or Color Code: Course_____ Service__________ Activity______

Kind of Change	Area of Change	Number		Origin			Modifications			Relat ToPurp			Quality	
		Exp	Con	Sch	Cty	VC	Cont	Mean	Org	+	0	-	Maj	Min
MODIFY														
ADD														
SUBTRACT														
TOTALS														

Summary of Interview Data (page 2)

Reactions to:	Positive	Negative	Neutral
Self-Study			
Consultants			
Visiting Committee			
Changes in Curriculum			

Area of Rec.	COURSE						SERVICE						ACTIVITY					
Source of Rec.	F.C.			V.C.			F.C.			V.C.			F.C.			V.C.		
Nature of Rec.	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-	M
1 Finances																		
2 Faculty disagrees																		
3 Adm.disagrees																		
4.Personnel-ADA																		
5 Personnel unavailable																		
6 Space																		
7 Facilities																		
8 Materials																		
9 Demand																		
10 Unknown																		
11 Other																		

Summary of Interview Data (page 3)

KEY TO SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

Heading:	Identifying data should be transferred as defined in the proposal. Use XXX's to indicate no control school.
Form:	A separate page may be used for each of the following: courses, services and activities. The appropriate space should be checked, (X) to identify the kind of change being recorded on the form. Color coding may be used as an alternative procedure.
Type:	Modification, addition, and subtraction as defined in the research design.
Area:	Use Evaluative Criteria's code, e.g., D-1 = Art; G = Guidance, etc.
Number:	Number of changes recorded in each area as defined above. Exp = Experimental school Con = Control school
Origin:	Source of idea that led to the change. Sch = School staff. May be students, teachers, staff, or admin. personnel. Cty = County staff. May be supervisory, established policy or regulations set for use of funds. VC = Visiting committee.
Modification:	Applies only to modifications. This category is inappropriate to additions and subtractions. Con = content: alteration of content of a course or the nature of a service or activity Means = means of enabling change: assignment of personnel; procurement of supplies or equipment; or, alteration of physical facilities Org = organization for instruction; team teaching; independent study; flexible scheduling; ability grouping; or reorganization of staff to provide services (A-V, group guidance, etc.), and staff development programs.
Relat. to Purp:	Relation to purposes of the school. This is necessarily interpretive and must be judged by the research assistant making the visit. + = positive influence on attainment of objectives O = no influence on attainment of objectives - = militates against attainment of objectives

(page 3a)

Quality:

Major = Change deemed by research assistant to have a major impact on the program of the particular school, regardless of the nature of the change.

Minor = Change deemed by the research assistant to be ephemeral or of little consequence.

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY TABLES

TABLE E-1

NUMBER OF CURRICULUM CHANGES[a] REPORTED IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY YEAR AND BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Changes in Curriculum	Year of Preparation											
	1962-63(12)			1964-65 (12)			1965-66(12)			1966-67(10)		
	M	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-
Courses	164	77	6	179	51	12	247	52	9	111	25	3
Services	35	22	0	39	38	0	49	28	2	36	21	4
Activities	25	14	0	15	16	1	16	39	1	13	28	1
Totals	224	113	6	233	105	13	312	119	12	160	74	8

Changes in Curriculum	Method of Preparation								
	No Help (18)			Consultant(13)			Univ.Course(15)		
	M	+	-	M	+	-	M	+	-
Courses	211	69	11	194	65	7	296	71	12
Services	58	26	0	43	27	1	58	56	5
Activities	26	25	1	16	18	0	27	54	2
Totals	295	120	12	253	110	8	381	181	19

Changes in Curriculum	All Schools(46)			Total Changes
	M	+	-	All Schools
Courses	701	205	30	936
Services	159	109	6	274
Activities	69	97	3	169
Totals	929	411	39	1379

[a] M = Modification
+ = Addition
- = Subtraction

TABLE E-2

NUMBER AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY YEAR OF PREPARATION

Changes in Curriculum	Year of Preparation																	
	1962-63(12)						1964-65(12)						1965-66(12)					
	Mod.		Add		Sub.		Mod.		Add		Sub.		Mod.		Add		Sub.	
	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.
Courses	164	13.7	77	6.4	6	0.5	179	14.9	51	4.3	12	1.0	247	20.6	52	4.3	9	0.8
Services	32	2.9	22	1.8	0	0.0	39	3.3	38	3.2	0	0.0	43	4.1	28	2.3	2	0.2
Activities	25	2.1	14	1.2	0	0.0	15	1.3	16	1.3	1	0.1	13	1.3	39	3.3	1	0.1
Totals	224	18.7	113	9.4	6	0.5	233	19.4	105	8.8	13	1.1	312	26.0	119	9.9	12	1.0

Changes in Curriculum	1966-67 (10)						All Schools (46)						Total Changes			
	Mod.		Add		Sub.		Mod.		Add		Sub.		Exp.		Cont.	
	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.
Courses	111	11.1	25	2.5	3	0.3	701	15.2	205	4.5	30	0.7	936	20.3	270	15.0
Services	36	3.6	21	2.1	4	0.4	159	3.5	109	2.4	6	0.1	274	6.0	51	2.8
Activities	13	1.3	28	2.8	1	0.1	69	1.5	97	2.1	3	0.1	169	3.7	35	2.0
Totals	160	16.0	74	7.4	8	0.8	929	20.2	411	8.9	39	0.8	1379	30.0	356	19.8

TABLE E-3

NUMBER AND AVERAGE NUMBER OF CURRICULUM CHANGES REPORTED IN INTERVIEW BY PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN 46 SCHOOLS UNDERGOING SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION BY THE VISITING COMMITTEE BY METHOD OF PREPARATION

Changes in Curriculum	Method of Preparation																	
	No Help (18)						Consultants (13)						Univ. Course (15)					
	Mod.		Add		Sub.		Mod.		Add		Sub.		Mod.		Add		Sub.	
	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.
Courses	211	11.7	69	3.8	11	0.6	194	14.9	65	5.0	7	0.5	296	19.7	71	4.7	12	0.8
Services	58	3.2	26	1.4	0	0.0	43	3.3	27	2.1	1	0.1	58	3.9	56	3.7	5	0.3
Activities	26	1.4	25	1.4	1	0.1	16	1.2	18	1.4	0	0.0	27	1.8	54	3.6	2	0.1
Totals	295	16.4	120	6.6	12	0.7	253	19.5	110	8.5	8	0.6	381	25.4	181	12.1	19	1.3

Changes in Curriculum	All Schools (46)						Total Changes			
	Mod.		Add		Sub.		Exper. Sch.		Control Sch.	
	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.	No.	Av.
Courses	701	15.2	205	4.5	30	0.7	936	20.3	270	15.0
Services	159	3.5	109	2.4	6	0.1	274	6.0	51	2.8
Activities	69	1.5	97	2.1	3	0.1	169	3.7	35	2.0
Totals	929	20.2	411	8.9	39	0.8	1379	30.0	356	19.8

APPENDIX F

NUMBER AND MEAN NUMBER OF RESPONSES OF 1714 TEACHERS IN 46 SCHOOLS TO EACH ITEM ON THE TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE ON CURRICULUM CHANGE

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE ON CURRICULUM CHANGE

The questions below are designed to elicit your opinions about the way the curriculum changes in your school. Please answer all of the questions in terms of the whole school as you see it.

I. Please rate the influence of the following in changing the curriculum of your school. Use the 0-3 scale, with 0 meaning no influence and 3 meaning very influential. NA means this item does not apply to your school.

	Not Applicable NA	No Influence 0	1	2	Very Influential 3	Mean
1. Administrative staff of the system	73	94	261	420	548	2.1
2. Administrative staff of your school	29	40	186	489	652	2.3
3. Guidance staff	60	141	421	506	268	1.7
4. Supervisors and resource personnel	88	182	434	475	217	1.6
5. Consultants from outside the system	185	306	512	298	95	1.2
6. Lay groups	184	479	523	169	41	0.8
7. Faculty	20	75	320	523	458	2.0
8. State department of education	97	143	277	466	413	1.9

	Not Applicable NA	No Influence 0	1	2	Very Influential 3	Mean
9. National curriculum revision groups (SMSG, BSCS, etc.)	292	231	369	345	159	1.4
10. Testing programs	97	183	490	475	151	1.5
11. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	79	96	279	469	473	2.0
12. State legislature	164	285	424	310	213	1.4
13. Professional organizations	140	364	468	347	77	1.1
14. Federal support	128	205	399	399	265	1.6
15. Civil rights activities of U. S. Government	234	446	347	228	141	1.1

II. In your opinion what has helped or hindered curriculum change in your school?

	Not Applicable	Hindered a	No Change b	Helped c	Mean
1. Faculty involvement in curriculum decisions	65	14	208	1109	2.8
2. Working with other teachers	59	6	209	1122	2.8
3. Visiting other schools	350	3	369	374	2.6
4. Faculty meetings with the principal	81	22	325	968	2.7

	Not Applicable NA	Hindered a	No Change b	Helped c	Mean
5. Faculty committees	99	7	282	1008	2.8
6. Workshops	323	9	388	676	2.6
7. Noncredit faculty study projects	525	8	405	458	2.5
8. Faculty planning and in-service training day	261	18	386	731	2.6
9. University or college courses	163	7	295	931	2.7
10. National Science Foundation or NDEA institutes	285	0	219	892	2.8
11. Community survey by school	345	11	424	616	2.6
12. School survey by outside agency	480	8	366	542	2.6
13. Parent-faculty committees	492	20	499	386	2.4
14. System-wide curriculum planning	254	36	295	811	2.7
15. Pre-school planning conferences	145	28	404	819	2.6
16. Review of research published by others	228	3	416	749	2.6
17. Action research done in your school	373	2	300	721	2.7
18. Adequacy of physical facilities	59	323	243	771	2.3
19. Availability of qualified teaching personnel	74	178	259	885	2.5

III. In your opinion what changes resulted from the self-study?
A. The Program of the School

	Not Applicable NA	Decreased a	No Change b	Increased c	Mean
1. Relation of the program of the school to the stated philosophy of the school	43	17	459	877	2.6
2. The number of elective courses offered	50	37	517	792	2.6
3. Freedom of choice in what the student takes	56	53	709	578	2.4
4. Amount of cooperative planning among faculty	34	15	457	890	2.6
5. Number of teachers trying out new procedures in the classroom	90	0	352	954	2.7
6. Number of guidance services available	54	12	618	712	2.5
7. Number of extracurricular activities available	45	33	787	531	2.4
8. Participation in extracurricular activities	60	30	797	509	2.4
9. Uniformity of grading standard	66	9	1027	294	2.2
10. Number of library materials available	34	4	226	1132	2.8
11. Student use of library	77	35	578	766	2.6

	Not Applicable NA	Decreased a	No Change b	Increased c	Mean
12. Quantity of audio-visual aids available	35	11	445	905	2.7
13. Quality of audio-visual aids available	47	14	564	771	2.6
14. Number of health services available	69	14	912	401	2.3
15. Number of courses required for graduation	108	2	1192	94	2.1
16. Number of students in each class	48	282	859	207	1.9
17. Amount of time provided for teacher planning	32	60	1140	166	2.1

B. Professional Staff

	NA	Worsened	No Change	Improved	Mean
1. Teachers' relationship to principal	53	28	758	557	2.4
2. Teachers' attitude toward total school	35	76	516	769	2.5
3. Teachers' attitude toward community	48	35	841	472	2.3
4. Teachers' attitude toward pupils	38	19	746	593	2.4
5. Teachers' attitude toward evaluation	41	152	479	724	2.4
6. Teachers' attitude toward teaching	42	46	588	720	2.5
7. Teachers' attitude toward other teachers	40	40	346	670	2.5

		Not Applicable	Decreased	No Change	Increased	Mean
8.	Teachers' understanding of school philosophy	28	15	339	1014	2.7
9.	Teachers' agreement with school philosophy	42	39	604	711	2.5
10.	Teaching on the basis of the school philosophy	64	9	624	699	2.5
11.	Teachers' membership in professional organizations	87	72	898	339	2.2
12.	Teachers' active participation in professional organizations	76	52	943	325	2.2
13.	Teachers' appreciation of contribution of other departments to achieving purposes of the school	38	10	395	953	2.7

IV. In your opinion what elements of the evaluation helped or hindered curriculum change?

		Not Applicable NA	Hindered a	No Influence b	Helped c	Mean
1.	Developing the philosophy of the school	56	12	394	934	2.7
2.	Studying the pupil population of the school	58	6	417	915	2.7
3.	Surveying the community	99	4	496	797	2.6

	Applicable NA	Hindered a	No Influence b	Helped c	Mean
4. Serving on "D"committees (program of studies)	215	2	271	908	2.8
5. Serving on "E"-"H" committees (guidance, instructional materials, health service, student activities)	241	2	284	869	2.8
6. Serving on "I"-"J" committees (school plant, school staff and administration)	339	3	360	694	2.7
7. The visits by the visiting committee	53	16	317	1010	2.7
8. The oral report of the visiting committee	82	12	334	968	2.7
9. The written recommendations of the visiting committee	94	11	191	1100	2.8
10. Post-visitation faculty meetings	232	8	421	735	2.6
11. Post-visitation committee meetings	369	8	404	615	2.6
12. The follow-up study of the graduates of your school	493	1	348	554	2.6
13. The study of the causes of drop-outs from your school	368	0	435	593	2.6